G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7 14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1892-3
191.
(In Uzrai)

File No. 361

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Passing orders on the appeal Petition of Karaga Tirumara
-neingar of Melkote regarding his claim to the Chicka
-rpattegarship in the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote
on the claim of the Sri Parakala matt to appoint one of the K
-lagudi Sarpattegaras in the said temple

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

Appeal petition from Karagatiruvarayana Iyengar of Mêlkota, against the order of the Mysore Deputy Commissioner rejecting his claimes to the Checka Parapattegarship in the Mêlkota temple.

The following are the facts of the case:—

In the year 1862, one Chelwaraya Iyengar, the appellants' father, who was the Checka Parapattegar of the Melkote temple was transferred to the Gangadhareswara Swamy temple in Srirangapatam; but on his failure to join the latter institution owing to ill-health, his services were dispensed with in 1863, by order of Major Mc' Hutchen, the then Supt of the Ashtagram Division.

2. Subsequently, one Venkata ramana Sastri was appointed Chicka Parapattegar; But in the year ~~1868~~ 1866. this person too was dismissed along with certain other servants of the temple for disrespectful behaviour towards the Guru of the Parakala matt and a third individual Kotnur Rangachar was appointed to the office. Again in the follow ing year 1867. the office was at the request of Ranga Cha transferred to his younger brother Venkat Narasimha Char, the present Chicka Parapattegar of the Melkote temple.

Cheluvasthaya Iyengar died shortly after his dismissal in 1863, leaving behind him a minor son Tirumarayana Iyengar, the appellant.

In May 1887, the latter who was then nearly 25 years old first commenced proceedings to recover the office, which he said had long been a hereditary one in his family. In the course of the enquiry that followed, Venkataharasimha Char the present incumbent, deposed before the Amildar as follows.

3-10-90

"I heard the deposition of Timmarayappa read out to me. This Chickapanapatyapanship does of course, belong to him by hereditary right. I have been looking after the duties for the past 25 years in obedience to the orders of Govt. I do not wish that Timmarayappa Iyengar shd. proceed with his petition. The office may be registered in his name. I have neither no children male or female. This appointment was first given to my brother and subsequently to me. As the right to the office does not belong to me, but to Timmarayappa Iyengar, I have no objection to him being appointed to look after the duties. None else has any right to interfere in it. It shd. be registered in the name of Tim.

Accordingly the amildar of the Srirangapatam Taluk in reporting the case to the orders the Sub-Divisional-Officer, French Rocks recommended the recognition of the transfer of the office to the appellant Tirumarayana Iyengar as agreed to by Venkat Narasimha Char. This recommendation of the amildar was accepted by the Sub-Divisional-Officer French Rocks. Order No 26 of 5-4-91

4. Thereupon one Krishna Iyengar the son of Kotwar Rangachar and nephew of Venkat Narasimha Char above referred to appealed to the Deputy Commissioner against the above order of the Sub-Divison Officer, on the ground that ~~the Office of the Chucka~~ deceased his father Rangachar had been permanently appointed Chicka Parapattegar of the

Melkote Temple and that the office had been transferred to his uncle Venkat Narasimha Char only as a temporary measure during his (Krishna Iyengar's) minority and that Venkat Narasimha Char cannot therefore resign the same in favor of Tirumarayana Iyengar the appellant, to the prejudice of his (Krishna Iyengar's) hereditary right. The Deputy Commissioner after hearing both parties passed an order to the effect that Chelvara Iyengar lost all his lien on the appointment by his dismissal in 1863, and that his son the appellant Tirumarayana Iyengar cannot succeed on the strength of hereditary right. The papers were however once more referred to the Asst. Commissioner, French Rocks who was called upon to report

D/28/10/91.

his findings on the following points:—

Whether Venkat Narasimha Nar is competent to transfer his appointment to an outsider

2. Whether the appointment does not ~~rest~~ vest in the Govt. Dept

3. Whether the pir of Rangalnar should not have a hereditary ~~right~~ claim to it.

5 The Sub-Division-Officer referred back these questions to the Amildar of Srirempatam for enquiry. In the course of this second enquiry Venkat Narasimha Nar ~~deposed~~ ~~as~~ deposed ~~x~~. ~~as~~ on 25-11-91.

follows:—

" The Chickpan a pathapanship of the Melkote Temple was in my hand. I was suffering from Stomach ache for the past 4 or 5 years. My brother's Son. Krishna Iyengar & others who are now in the Court, did not give me even a Cup of water. I have neither Children nor wife. I have no right to ~~transfer~~ give away my appointment to others. If the Office belonging to Krishna Iyengar I consented to ~~give~~ transfer it to Tirumanya Iyengar, only because, I was ~~sorry that~~ Krishna Iyengar had not treated me with due Consideration & respect".

The papers connected with the enquiry by the Amildar were submitted to the Sub-Division-Officer who in his turn sent up the same for the orders of the Deputy Commissioner with the following record of his findings on the points raised in the Deputy Commissioner's order of 28th October 1911.

1. Tirumarayana Iyengar can claim no hereditary right to the office now

2. Venkat Narasimhachar is not competent to transfer his appointment to Tirumarayana Iyengar, who must be considered to be an outsider

3. The appointment rests entirely with the Revenue authorities.

4. Krishna Iyengar, the son of Rangachar has a

hereditary right to the Chicka
his Parapattegarship of the Melkote
po temple than Tirumarayana
Iyengar, the son of Chelavaraya
har Iyengar.
hir

6.

2 Thereupon the Deputy
doe Commissioner Mr. Ranganayaka Iyengar
De passed the following order:— 29-5-92.

3 × × × ×
sh

7. Tirumarayana Iyengar, the
5 Son of Chelavaraya Iyengar
now appeals to Govt against
re the above order of the Deputy
& Commr on the grounds set
pe forth in his Engl. petition
c which is herewith submitted
le

2

Office note

The Parapattegars' offices
are not hereditary — Vide
G.O. dated 5th March 1892
of the Mysore Gazette
Govt place [illegible]

[illegible] with the Commissioner ...

order of the Sub-Division Officer recognising such right should be set aside.

"No orders need be passed in this case as regards the filling up of the appointment."

7. Srinivarayana Iyengar, son of Chelvaraya Iyengar, now appeals to Govt, against the above order of the Deputy Commissioner, on the grounds set forth in his Eng petition which is herewith submitted.

R. Sir by the Inspector General

The Parpattegars' appointments are not hereditary — this is evident from the transfer of the office holders from one place to another. — — a true Copy of Order to be returned

Sir by the Inspector General

a hereditary right to the Chicka Parapattegarship of the Melkote temple than Tirumarayana Ayengar the son of Cheluvaraya Ayengar.

6. Thereupon the Deputy Commissioner Mr. Ranganaswamy Ayengar passed the following order:— 19-5-92.

× × × ×

7. Tirumarayana Ayengar, the son of Cheluvaraya Ayengar now appeals to Govt against the above order of the Deputy Commr on the grounds set forth in his Engl. petition which is herewith submitted

---

Office note

The Govt Authorities' orders are not necessary — Orders of Court from the Court of the Officers from one place to another

Order of the Sub-Division Officer recognising such right should be set aside.

"No orders need be passed in this case as regards the filling up of the appointment."

7. Srinivarayana Iyengar son of Chelvaraya Iyengar now appeals to Govt, against the above order of the Deputy Commissioner, on the grounds set forth in his Eng petition which is herewith submitted.

R. Sir & the Inspector General

The Parpattegars' appointments are not hereditary — this is evident from the transfer of the office holders from one place to another. — a formal Copy of the Order of Govt is to be sent to the Dist

Council

The Government of His Highness the ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ Maha Rajah of Mysore

ನೇ 1892
ಸೆ 1893ನೇ ಇಸವಿ Ramma Appeal Case ನಂಬರ್

Appellant ಹಾಜಿ } ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ. Respondent
Timmaniengar ಗೆ ತಿಮ್ಮನಿಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್

ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್, ಮಿಸ್ಟರ್, ಕ- ಟಿ- ನರಸಿಹ್ಮಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ರವರಿಗೆ. Appellant
Timmaniengar ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ನಾಮೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಿವರ ದಿಸಿ ಫೈನಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ನನಗೆ ಪ್ರತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತ್ವೇವು ವ ಗೈರೆ ತೆಗದುಕ್ಕೊಂ ಬಂದಿ ಕೊಡಿಕ್ಕೂ ನೀವಾ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟ್ರದ್ದೇನೆ, ಅದ್ದು ರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಯಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನೇ ಮಿದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಬವ್ವುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 16ನೇ ನವೆಂಬರ್
ಸೆ 1893 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

ನಮ್ಮು

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ
T. Narasimhaiengar
Advocate for Appellant.

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ್ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಸೂರು ತುಂಬೇಕೋವಿನ್ಸಿರುನ, ಟಿ, ರಾಜ ಮಹೇಶ್ವರಾಗಿ ಜಿಗಣಿಯ ವಾಗಿರ್ವ್ಯೂ(ಬ)ನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪ್ಪಲ್ 1893.

17-12-63.

X 16-10-60.

X

5—4—91.

16—10—90.

31—10—90.

28—11—90.

15—5—87.

1—2—67

6—4—66.

9—2—8

ಅಂಕಣ ಬರಹಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾದ ಲೇಖನಗಳು

ಕೃತಿಯ ಹೆಸರು – ಸಂಪಾದಕರ ಹೆಸರು – ಪ್ರಕಾಶಕರು – ಪ್ರಕಟವಾದ ವರ್ಷ

ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಹೆಸರು – ಪ್ರಕಟವಾದ ದಿನಾಂಕ – ಪುಟ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

15. ಅನುಬಂಧ 37

ಪುಟ 1

ಕೆಳಗಿನ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಆದೇಶ

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯಾಗಿ

ನಿಯಮಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶ ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯವರು ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಲ್ಲದೆ, ಸಿಂಧೂರ ಪಕ್ಷಿಧಾಮದ

ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ತಿಂಗಳು 5

ದಿನಗಳಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಸಿಂಧೂರ ಪಕ್ಷಿಧಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ

ಕೆಲಸದ ಹಂಚಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಆದೇಶಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆಜ್ಞಾನುಸಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಆದೇಶದಂತೆ

By order

Mr Narain Rao

for Chief Secretary

ಸಹಿ/-

ಮುಖ್ಯ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯವರಿಗೆ.

ಸಹಿ/- 30-9-93

M Krishnamurthy

129

Petition Dept

12/60

29 SEP. 93
DEWAN OF MYSORE

ನೋಟೀಸ್.

[illegible]

[illegible] ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು [illegible]

[illegible]

ನೀನು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾ

[illegible]

ಯಿಜಿದ 1892ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮಾಹೆ 29 ನೇ ಮುರಕುಮಿನ ಅಪ್ಪೀಲ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಯು 16 ನೇ

ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ [illegible] ಕೊಕ್ಕೈಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಲ್ಪಡುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆದಿವಸ ಮಧ್ಯಾನ್ಹ

11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀನಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ನಿನ್ನ ಕಡೇ ಪ್ಲೀಡರ ವ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟಾಗಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸ ರೂಬ

ರೂಬ್ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

[illegible]

By Order,

M. Narain Rao

For Chief Secretary.

ಹುಜೂರ್ ದಿವಾನ್ ಆಫೀಸ್,
ತಾ|| 25 ನೇ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ಮಾಹೆ
189 3ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಕೊಕ್ಕೈಂ.

[illegible]

[illegible]

Mysore Government Central Press, Bangalore.—17-1-93—2,000.

29 SEP.

ನೋಟೀಸ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

ನೀನು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾ

ಯಿಶಿದ 1892 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ 29 ನೇ ಮುರಕುಮಿನ ಅಪ್ಪೀಲ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಯು 16 ನೇ

ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಲ್ಪಡುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆದಿವಸ ಮಧ್ಯಾನ್ಹ

11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀನಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ನಿನ್ನ ಕಡೇ ಪ್ಲೀಡರ ವ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟುಗಲಿ ನವ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸ ರೂಬ

ರೂಬ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

By Order,

for Chief Secretary.

ಹುಜೂರ ದಿವಾ ಆಫಿಸ,
ತಾ 29 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ
1893 ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಂ

Mysore Government Central Press, Bangalore.—17-1-93—2,000.

29 SEP. 93

DEWAN SECRETARIAT

ನೋಟೀಸ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

ಆರಡರಿನ

ಮೇಲೆ ದಾಖಲ್ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅಪ್ಪೀಲ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಮಾಹೆ ತಾರೀಖು 16 ರಲ್ಲು ಹಿಯರಿಂಗ್

ಆಗುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ಮಧ್ಯಾನ್ನ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ

ವೊಕ್ಕಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನವ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸ ರೂಬರೂಬ್ ನೀನಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ನಿನ್ನ ಕಡೆ ಪ್ಲೀಡರ್ ವ ಆಡ್ವೊಕೇಟಾಗಲಿ

ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

By Order,

M Narain Rao

For Chief Secretary.

ಮೈಸೂರ ದಿವಾ ಆಫೀಸ

ತಾರೀಖು 29 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್

189 ಇಸವಿ ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಂ.

Mysore Govt, Central Press, Bangalore.—17-1-93.—2,000.

(Ge Seri 2.) 20

1892

Branch

BD
M
30/12/92

No. 1366

Name of Petitioner. Kanaga Iruvanna

Village. Melkote

Taluk Seringapatam

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi, 29 7 92

Date of Receipt. 3 - 12 - 92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures one

ABSTRACT.

Appeal agt. Dejlan mis' order dated 9th May 1892 in re the disputed claim to the office of Chief Archaka of the Melkote temple

SKR
9/12/92

Mysore Govt Central Press Bangalore- 7 9 92,—1000

92

21 3 92

REG'D. No 1366 R
DATE 3-12-92

REG'D. No 234
DATE 30-11-92

In the Court of the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore. Appeal Case no: 1366/5

Appellant
1st Counter petitioner

Karaga Tirumaraiyan
Melkota Seringapatam
Taluq

vs

Respondent
Petitioner

Krishnadyengar Son of
Kotmur Rungachar. Melko
Seringapatam Taluq

The appellant above named begs to appe to this honorable Court against the order passe by the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore dated 9th May 1892 for the following reasons: ——

I That the petitioner has no locus-Standi and so his petition is not maintainable.

II The petitioner totally failed to prove that the office of Chicka Parapattagar in the Melko Temple was given to V Narasimachar tempora and that the said Narasimachar was a guard to the petitioner.

III The finding of the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore that the Office of Chicka Parapatta

as been clearly admitted by both parties that the 1st Counter Petitioner's (Appellant's) father was the huckdar to that office and the Sub division Officer's finding to the contrary is erroneous.

V There is no evidence to prove that the 2nd Counter petitioner V. Narasimachar had no right to transfer the office.

VI That the order of the Deputy Commissioner is opposed to Law, evidence on record and the probabilities of the Case

VII The 1st Counter petitioner's (Appellant's) right to his office is not barred by limitation. ಹಾಗೂ ಇತರರು

Dated 29th July 9:

Mysore

MUZRAI DEPART

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Appeal

The accompanying Petition No. 1366

dated 29th July 1892 received at the

Dewan's Office from Karaga Linnaraam

- Iyengar of Melkote Sreerung-

- patam Taluk,

is forwarded, together with its one

enclosures, to the Deputy Commission

Mysore District for

submission of the entire

records connected with th

Appeal

By Order,

Mysore
~~BANGALORE~~,
3-2- 1893.

Muzrai Secretary.

13-3-93

To, From Mr Lawrence 18693/13/3/93

(General Serial N. 500)

OFFICE OF THE
322
MUZRAI
BRANCH
1893
DEWAN OF MYSORE

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

Mooppil
The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 13th May 1893

Despatched

Received 17

Enclosures No. Petition No. 1366 with its 1 enclosure & records.

General No.

No. 1369

Submitting as called for the proceedings connected with the petition from Koraga Srinivasa Iyengar of Melkote, Seringapatam Taluk.

C Narasimha Iyengar
Bangalore
17/5/93

To the Samens 574 8/28/11/8
46-93

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—27-1-93.—5,000.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore 13th May 1893.

From

A Rangaswamy Iyengar Esquire B.A, B.L
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To Mysore
The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore,

SIR,

With reference to your memo no 540 dated 13th March 1893, forwarding for submission of proceedings, petition from Koraga Timoonarna Iyengar of Melkote Seringapatam Taluk, regarding the office of Chick parapattegar in the said temple, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire records connected with the case, together with the petition received with your memo.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
A Rangaswamy
Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

ನೋಟೀಸ.

ಆರ್ಡರಿನ

ಮೇಲೆ ದಾಖಲ್ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅಪ್ಪೀಲ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಸಿ ಸ್ಪ್ರಂ ಚರ್ ಮಾಹೇ ತಾರೀಖು 28 ರಲ್ಲು ಹಿಯರಿಂಗ್

ಆಗುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ಮಧ್ಯಾನ್ನ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಲ್ಲಿ

ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಂನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸ್ ರೂಬರೂಬ್ ನೀನಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ನಿನ್ನಕಡೇ ಪ್ಲೀಡರ್ ವ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ಟುಗಲಿ

ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಮೈಸೂರ್ ದಿವಾ ಆಫೀಸ್
ಮು ಬ ಶ್ರೀ ಯು ಯು ಂಬರ್
ತಾರೀಖು 17 ನೇ ಮಾಹೇ
189 3 ಮೊಕ್ತಂ.
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

Asst.

Mur: Chief Secretary.

೨೫

ನೋಟೀಸ.

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮೇಲುಕೋಟೆಯ ಸ್ಥಿರ ಚರಆಸ್ತಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧ್ಯ

ನೀನು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾ

ಯಿಸಿದ ೧೨೪ಯಿಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿಮಾಹೆ 29 ನೇ ಮರಕುಮಿನ ಅಪ್ಪೀಲ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಸೆಟ್ಲ್ಮಂಟ್ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

೨೪ ನೇತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವೊಕ್ಕಾಂನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಲ್ಪಡುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ದಿವಸ ಮಧ್ಯಾನ್ನ 11

~~~~~~~~~~ ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀನಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ನಿನ್ನ ಕಛೇ ಪ್ಲೀಡರ್ ವ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟಾಗಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸ್ ರೂಬ

ರೂಬ್ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಹುಜೂರ್ ದಿವಾನ್ ಆಫೀಸ್
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು
ತಾರೀಖು 17 ನೇ ಮಾರ್ಚ್
ಸನ್ 1893.
ವೊಕ್ಕಾಂ.
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

Mysore Chief Secretary.
~~~~~~~~~~

ನೋಟೀಸ್.

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ನಿವಾಸಿಯಾದ [illegible]

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಗ್ರಾಮದ [illegible]

ಎಂಬುವವರು, ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡವರಿಗೆ [illegible]

ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಕೋಡಿನ ಆರ್ಡರಿನ

ಮೇಲೆ ದಾಖಲ್ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅಪ್ಲೀಕೇಷನ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಮೇರೆ ತಾರೀಖು 28 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಯರಿಂಗ್

ಆಗುವದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ಮಧ್ಯಾನ್ನ 11½ ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ

ಮೊಕ್ತಾಂನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಲಫೀಸ್ ರೂಬರೂಬ್ ನೀನಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ನಿನ್ನ ಕಡೇ ಪ್ಲೀಡರ್ ವ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟುಗಲಿ

ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಮೈಸೂರ್ ದಿವಾನ್ ಆಫೀಸ್
ತಾರೀಖು 17 ನೇ ಮಾರ್ಚ್
ಸ್ವ 1893 ಮೊಕ್ತಾಂ.
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ

By Order,

Chief Secretary.

Secretary

By order

Dtd-

18-7-93

ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಂಠಿ ಪ್ರಸಾದ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ

ಸಂಪಾದಕರು

ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಭ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಭ ದಿನಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂಪಾದಕೀಯ ಲೇಖನವು ಸಂಘದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಅಪಾರ ಬೇಸರವನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಾರಿ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಲೇಖನವನ್ನು ಖಂಡಿಸಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ

Gil237

మైసూరుసంస్థానదర్బారు -

దివాణశాఖ-లిమిటెడ్ కంపెనీలాభ

యిందాం

శ్రీరంగపట్నంతాలూకు అమల్దార్రికి బరనిశ్శ

దినిదనిరుంపు అడాంగి.

శ్రీరంగపట్నంబ్లూకు మీలియ్యోలి

యల్లరువ శి-శ్రమంరువక్కోసాఖ మేంటెంటనరశిం

హాచార్, రిరంగ తిరునారప్పయ్యంగార్, హొట్ట

రు శ్రీష్ణయ్యంగార్, యిం మూరుజనగళకిన

రినేశయుంరాంద నోంటిలిసేగళు బన్నయుద

రింతనేరళుసిరుక్కే కేష్టంబిత్ బిసేశారిల

ఇ దినబేంగళూరుమోర్సింనల్లిం బరింత

లిళువద్దరింద వాయిదేలుందకవాచ్ర్తిమప్ర

కారబాంరియింద అనిల్ నోంటిలిసేగళన్నర

నుంరిసేవాన్తిశవానికుకెళ్ళిద్దిదే.

తేగ 18.7 1893

బేంగళూరు

Bigot der
Secretary

No. 841. 487

MYSORE DEWÁN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1316

dated 21st November 93 received at the

Dewan's Office from Srinivasa Iyengar (by M. B. Srinivasa Iyengar advocate) applying for a copy of the decision of Government in the Muzarai appeal case, Krishnamyangar & Narasimhangar

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~ to the transferred to the Muzarai Secretary for disposal.

By Order,

for Chief Secretary

BANGALORE, 28th November 1893.

Ag

Issued

Ag

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—17 11 92—3,000.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REGD. N. 13768
DATE 22-11-93

Copy granted.
K.V.
1-12-93

Copy received.
Mirzathalikha
clerk
9/12/93

No. 580 Rev.
Inam 7.46-7/8

37

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
Inamai PETITION DEPARTMENT,
2-12-1893

4

Endorsement granted to Karayada Sirunarayana Iyengar of Melkote-Srirangapatam Taluk

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1366 dated 29.7.92 appealing against the Deputy-Commr's order regarding the ~~office~~ Petitioner's claim to the office of Chikka Parupattegar in the temple of Melkote.

Petitioner is informed that ~~Petitioner's~~ the claim cannot be settled on a Inam petition he should establish his right by a regular suit before a competent authority.

The enclosure is returned.

"By Order"

Draft

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2 93—2000.

Pch
No. 1864

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE

780

MUZRAI BRANCH

15

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION ENDORSEMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 3063

dated 14th April /94 received at the

Dewan's Office from Karagada Tirumaraiengar of Malkote, Srirangapatna Taluk, praying for permission to file his suit in respect of temple Parpatteyar in either the Bangalore or Kassan District.

is forwarded, together with its ~~enclosures~~ transferred, to the Secretary Muzrai Department

By Order,

T Chandra Rau

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 16th May 1894. 18

M. G. C. P. Bl., [illegible]—17 11 92—3,000.

To

Vide Endorsee No: 1037 M
21.5.1894

35

OP No 1366 of 1892 – P.3

Appt

Karagada
Tirunarayanayyangar
of Melkota
Srirangapattanam
Taluq
represented by
Mr T. T. Narasimhayyangar
Advocate.

Respt

Respondent

By a Miscellaneous Petition the
appt sought to establish his right to
the office of Chekka Parpattigar in the
Temple of Melkota. The Dy Com^r
dismissed the application on various
grounds among which one was that the
office claimed is not hereditary. The
appeal is against the order.

Important claims like these
cannot be settled on Miscellaneous Petns
The appt should establish his right by
a regular Suit – before a competent authority

Rejected as above

17/10/93

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Petition ~~Appeal~~ No. 1366 of 1892-93

Appellant — Vs. — Respondent.

Karagada Venkatarayanayanagar of Melkote, Seringapatam Taluk, represented by M. K. T. Narasimhachariyar Advocate — Krishnayangar

No 373 / Mus 46-93 — Decision of 20-11-93

By a Miscellaneous Petition the appellant sought to establish his right to the Office of Chikka Parpatteyar in the temple of Melkote. The Deputy Commissioner dismissed the application on various grounds among which one was that the Office claimed is not hereditary. The appeal is against this order.

38

2 Important claims like these cannot be settled on Miscellaneous Petitions. The appellant should therefore establish his right by a regular suit before a competent authority.

By order

28/11

Jt Chief Secretary

N.11

573 + R

No 574 dt 28 - 11 - 93

Inward 46-93

Enclosure

Inwards Supte

Copy to the ~~Deputy Comm~~ Inspore Distt with the ver proceedings received with ~~his~~ letter No 1369 dated 13th May 1893 from the Dy Comm Mysore Distt

By Order

28/11

Jt. Chief Secretary

SV BR

Appeal petition from Karaga Tirumarriengar of Melkote, against the order of the Mysore Deputy Commissioner, rejecting his claim to the Chick Parpetta-garship in the Melkote Temple.

The following are the facts of the case:—

In the year 1862 one Cheluvaraya Iyengar, the appellant's father, who was the Chicka Parpattegar of the Melkote Temple was transferred to the Ganga-dhareswaraswamy Temple in Sriraungapatam; but on his failure to join the latter Institution, owing to — continued ill-health, his services were dispensed with in 1863, by order of Major McHutchin, the then Superintendent of the Ashtagram Division.

2. Subsequently, one Venkatramanasastri was appointed Chicka Parpattegar

But in the year 1866 this person too was dismissed along with certain other servants of the temple for disrespectful behaviour towards the Guru of the Parakala mutt, and a third individual Kotnur Rangachar was appointed to the office. Again in the following year 1867, the office was, at the request of Rangachar, transferred to his younger brother Venkatnarasimachar, the present Chika Parpattegar of the Melkote Temple.

3. Cheluvaraya Iyengar died shortly after his dismissal in 1863, leaving behind him, a minor son Jiyumarayanadyengar, the appellant. In May 1887 the latter who was then nearly 26 years old first commenced proceedings to recover the office, which he said had long been a hereditary one in his family. In the course of the enquiry that followed Venkatnarasimachar, the

present incumbent, deposed before the Amildar as follows:-

"I heard the deposition of Tirunarayana Iyengar read out to me. This Chicka Pattegar-ship does, of course, belong to him by hereditary right. I have been looking after the duties for the past 25 years in obedience to the orders of Govt. I do not wish that Tirunarayana Iyengar should proceed with his suit. The office may be registered in his name. I have no children male or female. This appointment was first given to my brother and subsequently to me. As the right to the office does not belong to us, but belongs to Tirunarayana Iyengar, I have no objection to his being appointed to look after the duties. None else has any right whatever to this office. It should be registered in the name of Tirunarayana Iyengar."

Accordingly the Amildar of the Srirangapatam Taluk in reporting the case to the orders of the Sub-Division Officer, French-Rock

recommended the recognition of the transfer of the Office to the Appellant, Srinarayana Iyengar, as agreed to by Venkat Narasimachar. This recommendation of the Amildar was accepted by the Sub-Division Officer, French-Rocks.

4. Thereupon one Krishna Iyengar, the son of Kotnur Rangachar and nephew of Venkat Narasimachar above referred to, appealed to the Deputy Commissioner, against the above order of the Sub-Division Officer, on the ground that his deceased father had been permanently appointed Chickadarpatteyar of the Melkote Temple and that the office had been transferred to his uncle Venkat Narasimachar only as a temporary measure during his (Krishna Iyengar's) minority and that Venkat Narasimachar, cannot, therefore resign the same in favor of Srinarayana Iyengar, the appellant, to the prejudice of his (Krishna Iyengar's) hereditary right. The Deputy Commissioner after hearing

both

both parties passed an order to the effect that Cheluvaraya Iyengar lost all his lien on the appointment by his dismissal in 1863, and that his son, the appellant, Tirumaraj Iyengar cannot succeed on the strength of hereditary right. The papers were, however, once more referred to the Sub-Division officer, French Rocks, who was called upon to record his findings on the following points:—

1. Whether Venkatnarasimachar is competent to transfer his appointment to an outside
2. Whether the appointment does not vest in the Muzrai Department.
3. Whether the son of Rangachar should not have a hereditary claim to it.

5 The Sub-Division Officer, referred back these questions to the Amildar of Srirangapatam for enquiry. In the course of this second enquiry Venkat narsimacha again deposed as follows:—

"The Baravard of the

Chickaparpattagarship of the Melkote Temple was in my name. I was suffering from stomach ache for the past 4 or 5 years. My brother's son Krishna Iyengar and others who are now in the Court did not give me even a cup of water. I have neither children nor wife. I have no right to give away my appointment to others. The Office belongs only to Krishna Iyengar. I consented to transfer it to Tirumarayana Iyengar, solely because Krishna Iyengar had not treated me with due consideration and respect."

The papers connected with the enquiry were submitted by the Amildar to the Sub-Division Officer, who in his turn sent up the same for the orders of the Deputy Commissioner with the following record of his findings on the points raised in the Deputy Commissioner's order dated 24th October 1891.

1 Tirumarayana Iyengar can claim no hereditary right

to the Office now.

2. Venkat Narasimachar is not competent to transfer his appointment to Tirumaraya Iyengar, who must be considered to be an outsider.

3. The appointment rests entirely with the Mysore authorities.

4. Krishna Iyengar, the son of Rangachar, has a preferential hereditary right to the Chicka Parpattagar-ship of the Melkote temple, than Tirumarayana Iyengar, the son of Cheluvaraya Iyengar.

6. Thereupon the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Rangaswamy Iyengar passed the following order:—

"The facts will be found stated in the previous order and in the findings of the Sub-Division Officer. The Pleader for appellant now contends that the post of Chick Parpattagar is a hereditary appointment. It is admitted that Parpattegars are not hereditary, but it is maintained Chick Parpattegars are. There is however nothing in the records in support of this contention. Even if this be true, I am afraid the petitioner,

(2nd Counter petitioner or Respondent) cannot succeed. It is admitted that his father was dismissed on his failure to Jam Gangadhareswaraswami temple. This order has not been set aside. The petitioner is now 29 years old and he did not take any action till 1886 or till after he was over 22 years of age (according to his pleader). It is alleged that the petitioner's guardian had carried on proceedings which stopped on his death many years ago, and the petitioner's application should be treated as a continuation of the same. The said proceedings have not even been filed in this case, and I am of opinion, therefore, that the petitioner's claim is time-barred.

It appears his first petition is dated 1887.

"It is not denied that 1st Counter petitioner was not competent to resign his appointment in favor of any one or that the Murai Department was at liberty to reject such resignation.

"For these reasons, it must be held that 2nd Counter petitioner has no right to the appointment, and the

Order of the Sub-Division Officer, recognising such right should be set aside.

"No orders need be passed in this case as regards the filling up of the appointment."

7. Tirumarayana Iyengar, son of Cheluvaraya Iyengar, now appeals to Govt against the above order of the Deputy Commissioner, on the grounds set forth in his Eng. petition which is herewith submitted.

Note by the Mysore Secretary. 10-7-93

The Parpattegars' appointments (whether Head Parpattegar or Chick Parpattegar) are not hereditary. This is evident from the transfer of the office holders from one place to another. A printed copy of the Circular lately issued on the subject is also sent up herewith.

If as decided by Govt, in favour of Mysore No 7 19 April 1892, the appointment of Parpattegar in a temple is not hereditary, the appellant's claim is inadmissible. Apart from that question appellant's father was dismissed in 1862 and appellant remained quiet for several years. Even after he attained majority and claimed the office in May 1887 he allowed the consent of

of the then Carpathian at the
time of the appointment
in his (appts) name. That
warrant was apparently
blanked otherwise. He thus
is at sea, such warrant
not binding on Khartoum —

If the appointment was
not hereby the Mayor of
was competent to nominate
any person to the Mun
and neither appt nor Khartoum
had any claims to the office

In either view should
reject the present appeal

BJ

10/7/93

To
The Worth. The Central Asia

I think so too, but
let us give a hearing
to the Petitioners —

LLC
13/7/93

I issue notices
Hearing 28 September
1893

14-7-93

Notices issued
18-7-93.
Adjourned to 16th Nov. 93.

Note Continued :—

The case was accordingly heard by messrs Thumboo Chetty and Chentsal Rao and it was decided in Government Proceedings no 573-74 / mag Fr 46-93 dated 28th November 1893 that important cases like these could not be settled on miscellaneous petitions and that the appellant should himself establish his right by a regular suit before a competent authority. An endorsement was accordingly issued to the appellant Timma-narasimyar.

Before the final decision of the case as above it appears from the records that Venkata narasimhachar had this Banaward of Chicka Ramappa transferred to the name of Kotwar Krishnimyar and had [illegible]

during the duty himself as his substitute, he being employed as a School master at Nellkota. The Promotion was, at the recommendation of the Sub-Division Officer of Gudur-Roads, retransferred to the name of Venkata Narasimhachar, as Krishnaiyar continued to hold as School master's post (vide Muzrai Secretary's Proceedings no $\frac{C\ 32}{621}$ dated 26th November 1895).

This arrangement continued till 1901.

51

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

NOTE FOR ORDERS.

Subject :— Telegram dt 28th January 1902 from Melkote Ramanuja Iyengar, and Letter No 2257 dated 30th January 1902 from the same and some others complaining against the action of the Sub-Divl: Officer of French-Rocks, directing that the Temple records should be placed at the disposal of the Parakala Matt Gumasta at Melkote. —

On the 26th Apr

the Timmanamangalam of
Kalkota, stating that he
was the Hakdar for the
⊛
Chegadi Parpathegar's post-,
held by one Venkata Rama-
:
Sankachar who was old
and infirm. This petition
was forwarded to the
Asst. Commissioner, Mysore
district, to report (1) whether
a permanent incumbent
of the Parpathegar
able to carry on the duties
(2) whether there was any
important Hakdar to replace
him in the Sankachar
(3) whether the petitioner
or the Parpathegar had any right
to the said post

as at present in 1901,

⊛ The original desc
was "Chick Parp
but in the transla
the English Patti it
changed to "Valagiri
Parpathya".

X with this
Rukkari no
dated 27
May 1901.

another petition was received from the same, alleging that at the request of Venkata-
-narasimhachar, the
permanent incumbent,
his son (Krishnaiengar) was appointed
by the Sub-Division Officer
as Valangaadi Sarpathegar.
This petition was also
forwarded to the Dy
Commr in continuation,
of the Amildari on the subject,
and he was requested to
fully explain the circumstances
which led the Sub-Division
Officer to make this new
appointment, in spite
of

the fact that a report had been called for by Govt
in the Rubkari ~~subject~~

referred to in para 1 above.

3. On the 12th October 1901,
another petition on the
same subject was received
from certain residents of
Melkota, complaining
against the action taken
by the Sub-Division Officer
in having made
~~making~~ the appointment
as requested in the Qazi
& from the Panchayatdars.
This petition was also
referred to the Dy Commr
Dy ~~Sub-Division~~ for early submission
of the report already
called for.

4. In reply, the Dy Commr
forwarded a copy

of the Sub-Division Officer's report to him, wherein an Officer had explained that the vacancy was temporarily filled up pending enquiry into and disposal of the claims put forward by several persons for the Office, in order to provide for the due performance of the duties pertaining to it without unnecessary break; that the incumbent temporarily appointed by him is the son of his predecessor and as such was the best eligible person for officiating in the post while the question of

was under enquiry;
that the Parakuka matt
at Mysore had represented
that the Hak to the said Office
belonged to it and that
the post should be confined
on the persons whom it
selected; that other
persons had also put in
their claims, which were
being enquired into, and
that on the completion
of the enquiry the result
would be duly reported.
This was recommended with
the remark that further
report was awaited
vide Govt Lr No 1026
Mys Jr 150 72
dated 11th January 1902).

5 On the 28th January 1902
a Telegram was received
by the address of the Dewan
from one Ramanujamma
Narasimhachar, which
runs as follows:—

" Petition follows.
" Sub-Division Bhavani
" Whole Malkote Temple
" records with Pura-
" -Kala mutt Gumasta.
" Four forgery-substi-
" -tutions destruction.
" Kindly Cancel
" orders immediately"

The Dewan's orders on
Telegram are as follows:-

" What is this about

"Why should all the
"records be entrusted
"to Parankula mutt?"

A petition has, as stated
since
in the Telegram, been received
from Ramanujammi
Narasimhachar and others,
in which the petitioners
state. —

i That this is an appeal
against the orders of the
Sub-Division Officer of
French-Rocks

ii That the Sadar Division
Officers Court have already
decided in their Case No
132-956 dated 26th November 1895,
that one of the two Chick-
-Parankula gurus' pants in
the temple was unnecessary

X X Nos 247 dated 1-10-901 & 231 dated 6-1-0

and that the present incumbent holding the said appointment is not a Hereditary

iii) that the Agent of the Parakulam Mutt addressed a letter to the Sub-Division Officer stating that the Chief Parpathyagar's appointment was at the Mutt's disposal and that the sole control over the Inam Lands in the said Village vested in the Mutt and that the Sub-Division Officer without any enquiry whatever based action upon that letter of the Mutt's Agent and accordingly issued order on the 1st Oct 1909.

iv) that they petitioned

6 The petitioners therefore pray that the order of the Sub-Division Officer may be cancelled and all that, as the Local Officers are partial to one party, the case may be decided either by Govt. or by any Govt Officer.

No orders have been issued from this office about entrusting the Temple Record to the Mutt's Gumastha.

Submitted to the Dewan

Sd/
4/2/02

The report called for from time to time regarding the appeal of Krishnayyar as Valagade Parpattegar has not yet been received

from the Dy Comr. The inter-
mediate report was recently
read stating that Kushavaya
had been appointed only
temporarily and that enquiries
were being made into claims
and a final report would
be called. That report is
awaited. Reference is
casually made in the Sub Dr
Officers letter to the fact that
the Parakala Matt claims
to have the selection for the
Valaguri Periyathagare post
and it is stated that that
point also is being enquired
into. For a full understanding
of the case, the original
records are required.

The Parakala Mutts Gumasta
referred to in the telegram must
be either the man who procures
"Theertha" on behalf of the
Matt or the called Mutha Mudre
the Matti deal on the temple
door. via

It is alleged in the petition,
the Sub Dr Officer has permitted

the Matto Gumasta to search
the papers in the Temple [illegible]
I think that such an order is
objectionable, and that he may
be asked to cancel his order
immediately. 4/2/02

3625

and may read
with further compli
cations thanks.
An unconcerned
& disinterested
Government must
be asked to read
the record

3281
R15.2.02

note continued:—

The above order
was communicated to
the Dy Commr, who, in
his letter no 308 dated
7th April 1902, states the
the records of the Melkote
temple were not entrusted
to the Gumasta of the Sri
Parakala swamis matt as
alleged in the petition.
From the Sub. Dy C.

17.II.02

X 2nd this office letter
no 1262-63 dated 21st
February 1902

(26) 64

Docket- no: 634 dated

31st March 1902 to the address

of the Dy Commr (Copy

of which has now been

received with the Dy Comm's

letter under reply) it-

is observed that no

such order as is referred

to in the Complaint- petition

was issued to the Sub-

Judge or to the Temple

Treasurer, but that

Copies of certain records

were applied for by the

Asstt Agent and they

were directed to be given —

In a subsequent-

petition received from

* no 860 dated

12th March 1902

from the same petitioners

they stated that only

such of the records as were

in support of the Sri

Parakala mutt's claim

were sent for by the

Inam Officers, but

that the petitioners' request

to grant certain copies

in support of their contention,

which was refused to be

complied with, although

(petitions)

they intimated the number

and date of the orders

whose copies were thus applied for. The petitions

also stated

(28) 60

that the matter might
be heard and disposed of
by this Office, and that
the orders of the Sub-Dy
Officer regarding the
appointment of the mukh's
man as the Valuperti
Sarpanchayat might be held
in abeyance pending
decision of this Appeal.

2. The above petition
had also been sent to
the Dy Commr in continuation
of the previous letter on
the subject. The Dy Commr
has returned the petition
with his Docket No 316 dated

9 6ᵗʰ (29)

15th April 1902, wherein he states that the report on the subject to have been submitted with his docket no 308 dated 7th April 1902 (referred to above).

14 The report on the result of the enquiry regarding the claim of the Sri Parankula matt, as already called for, has not yet been submitted receive d in this office.

Submitted

Ds

18/4/02

Subd to the decision for
perusal. The by commrs'
letter goes to shew that the
records were not, as stated
by the petrs, entrusted to
the agent of the Parakali Mutt.
The other statement made
by the petrs that copies asked
for by them were not given
has not been touched by
in the by commrs letter.
The petn itself seems to be
the outcome of malice on
the part of the petrs towards
the Parakali Mutt or its
agents. It does not therefore
appear necessary to
refer back the papers
to the by commrs for
information on the points
omitted in his letter.

Ks
24.6.07.

As far as I can
see, this requires
no order.
18.VIII.07

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

MGCPB—3 500—15-10 01

of the Deputy Secretary to Govt in charge of the Muzrai Department, he wrote Hag 7 to the Deputy Commissioner of the Ellpore District in April 1903, requesting to be furnished with his opinion as to whether the appointment of a separate Chikka Parpattegar to the vacant post was necessary and whether that opportunity might not be availed of to do away with the vacant post altogether, the pay thereof being utilised towards granting some increase to the other Chik Parpattegar Srinivasa Ramanujengar who was petitioning to Govt in the matter.

The Deputy Commissioner has now replied to the above communication forwarding the Report of the Divisional Assistant Commissioner Mr K Srinivasa Rao on the subject In this report, the Assistant Commissioner after says that it is necessary there should be two Chik Parpattegars for the responsible supervision of the temple, states that there are 4 applicants for the vacant post, one of them being the

No 430 dated 20th August '05 Papers under disposal

daughter-in-law of the last permanent holder of the appointment, two others great grandson and grandson-in-law of the last sole Parpatteyar Singaperumal Iyengar who died in 1833, and the remaining one being the other surviving Chik Parpatteyar of the temple. The Assistant Commissioner discusses their merits at length, and recommends that one of them by name Singlathar (grandson-in-law of Singaperumal Iyengar) Retired 2nd Grade Pleader, and the present Manêgar of the temple, may be appointed Chikka Parpatteyar, in the place of the deceased Venkata Narasimhathar, as being a learned and an orthodox Brahmin, and that the other Chikka Parpatteyar given some increase of pay, and for this purpose, proposes to utilise the savings of Rs 7-8 accruing annually for the past 2 years

owing to the non-performance of Mukha-
veenedamdayi and Doddatala services in the
temple. The Deputy Commissioner merely expresses
concurrence with the Assistant Commissioner
in so far as the appointment of Singlachar
to the vacant post in question is concerned.

In the Report, the Assistant
Commissioner also brings to notice that
the Para kala Matt lays claim to the
privilege of nominating the Chikka
Parpa Hegars for the temple, but that
the Swami has not produced any document
in support of the claim, though ample
time had been given to him for the
purpose.

All the above proposals made
by the Assistant and the Deputy Com-
missioners have been based on the
assumption that the office of Chikka
Parpa Hegen is not a hereditary one.
The only orders issued from this Office on

re subject are those contained in Govt
Po: No. 77-85, dated 19th April 1892, where
re non-hereditary nature of the Par-
vattegar's post is settled once for all. But
the Proceedings do not make any explicit
reference to the hereditary or non-hereditary
character of the Chikka Parpattegar's appoint-
ment. One of the applicants, Irumara-
pamenigar by name, great-grandson of
the late Singaperumal Iyengar referred
to above, has been petitioning the Sub-
Assistant Commissioner and to this Office
claiming the vacant post. On a former
occasion, when the latter had appealed
in an Petition
to the Govt, against the order of the
Deputy Commissioner deciding against
his claim, the Committee of the Council had
decided that "important claims like these
cannot be settled on miscellaneous peti-
tions". The Appellant should therefore
establish his right by a regular suit

"before a competent authority", to institute which, the Assistant Commissioner adds, the said applicant Srinivarayaniengar is now barred by limitation.

Sub?

Since submitting the above note, a communication has been received from the Deputy Commissioner, forwarding a petition addressed to him by the Agent of the Parakala matt In the petition, the Agent says that the opinion expressed by the Assistant Commissioner in the matter of the Matt's claim to nominate the Chikka Parpattegar of the Melkote temple is one-sided, based as it is, he says, on a forged Sanad of 1829 and on the fact that the Matt did not produce then a genuine Sanad. The Agent adds that he has applied to this Office for a copy of the required document being furnished to him from the Shabanama Register (in the Inspector Records); and

Letter No 445 dated 26th May 1905 C

and that it is no fault of the matt if its application was not complied with —

The Agent has submitted a similar petition to this Office also, wherein he states that no opportunity was given to the matt by the Sub-Division Officer to prove its claim by documentary evidence and prays therefore that the records may be returned back to the Dy Comrs for enquiry.

One Georgadi Venkatachinna-simhachari of Mukkota and one Singi Lakshmidevamma have also petitioned this Office claiming the Paupathyam's post in question.

This is so far as the history of the case is concerned —

The chief points now for decision are as follows —

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

(i) Whether the Valagundi Parupathyagar's appointment in question is a hereditary one as claimed by the petitioners, and if so, who is the proper claimant to be appointed to the vacant post. On page 4 of ~~(iii)~~ this note the late Inspector Rai Bahadur M. Srinivasa Chariar has recorded that "the Parupatyagar's appointments (whether Head Parupathyagar or Chinna Parupatyagar) are not hereditary".

(ii). Whether two Chinna Parupathyagars are necessary.

(iii) If the filling up of the vacant post be considered necessary, whether the right of nomination to the post rests with the two Parivaka mutt

matt as claimed by it on the strength of the Sunnud of 1819, or whether the Sunnud may be considered as having been cancelled by the subsequent Sunnud ~~alleged~~ said to have been granted in 1829 as alleged by the opposite party who have since produced the original copy through the Dy Commr. The Agent of the Perakulamatt ~~Swamy~~ argues that this is a forged document. When search was made for it in the Vernacular records of the Ground & Revenue Sunnuds, it is reported by the Vernacular Record-Keeper that no reference of it is forthcoming in the records —

Submitted

17/7/05

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-01

19

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Forwarded to the Secretary to Government, Financial & Revenue Departments, for favour of being placed before a Committee of Council.

By order

Bangalore
17th July 1905

Secretary to Govt.
Muzrai Dept.

Ll

NOTE. 80

Appeal petition from Karagada Tirunarayana Iyengar of Melkote against the order of the Mysore Deputy Commissioner, rejecting his claim to the Chick Parpettagarship in the Melkote Temple

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

The following are the facts of the case:-

In the year 1862 one Cheluvaraya Iyengar, the appellant's father, who was the Chicka Parpattegar of the Melkote Temple was transferred to the Gangadharaswaraswamy Temple in Srirangapatam; but on his failure to join the latter Institution, owing to continued ill-health, his services were dispensed with in 1863, by order of Major McHutchin, the then Superintendent of the Ashtagram Division.

2. Subsequently, one Venkataramana Sastri was appointed Chicka Parpattegar. But in the year 1866 this person too was dismissed along with certain other servants of the temple for disrespectful behaviour towards the Guru of the Parakala Mutt, and a third individual Kotnur Rangachar was ap-

ppointed to the office. Again the following year
867, the office was, at the request of Rangachar,
ransferred to his ~~yengar~~ younger brother Venkatanarasimachar,
he present Chicka Parpattegar of the Melkote Temple.

5. Cheluvaraya Iyengar died shortly after his
ismissal in 1863, leaving behind him, a minor son
Tirunarayana Iyengar, the appellant. In May 1887 the
latter who was then nearly 26 years old first com-
menced proceedings to recover the office, which he
said had long been a hereditary one in his family.
In the course of the enquiry that followed Venkat-
narasimachar, the present incumbent, deposed on the
31st October 1890 before the Amildar as follows:-

" I heard the deposition of Tirunarayana-
Iyengar read out to me. The Chicka Parpattegarship
does, of course, belong to him by Hereditary right.
I have been looking after the duties for the past
25 years in obedience to the orders of Government.
I do not wish that Tirunarayana Iyengar should proceed
with his suit. The Office may be registered in his
name. I have no children male or female. This appoint-
ment was first given to my brother and subsequently
to me. As the right to the office does not belong to
us, but belongs to Tirunarayana Iyengar, I have no

no objection to his being appointed to look after the duties. None else has any right whatever to this office. It should be registered in the name of Tirunarayana Iyengar".

Accordingly the Amildar of the Sri--rangapatam Taluk in reporting the case for the orders of the Sub Division officer, French Rocks, recommended the recognition of the transfer of the office to the appellant, Tirunarayana Iyengar, as agreed to by Venkatnarasimachar. This recommendation of the Amildar was accepted by the Sub Division officer, French Rocks.

4. Thereupon one Krishna Iyengar, the son of Kotnur Rangachar and nephew of Venkatnarasimchar above referred to, appealed to the Deputy Commissioner, against the above order of the Sub Division officer, on the ground that his deceased father had been permanently appointed Chicka Parpattegar of the Melkote Temple and that the office had been transferred to his uncle Venkatnarasima Char only as a temporary measure during his (Krishna Iyengar's) minority and that Venkat narasimachar, cannot, therefore resign the same in favour of Tirunarayana Iyengar, the appellant,

ppointed to the office. Again the following year
867, the office was, at the request of Rangachar,
ransferred to his ~~yengar~~ younger brother Venkatanarasimachar,
he present Chicka Parpattegar of the Melkote Temple.

. Cheluvaraya Iyengar died shortly after his
ismissal in 1863, leaving behind him, a minor son
irunarayana Iyengar, the appellant. In May 1887 the
atter who was then nearly 26 years old first com-
enced proceedings to recover the office, which he
aid had long been a hereditary one in his family.
n the course of the enquiry that followed Venkat-
arasimachar, the present incumbent, deposed on the
1st October 1890 before the Amildar as follows:-

" I heard the deposition of Tirunarayana-
yengar read out to me. The Chicka Parpattegarship
oes, of course, belong to him by Hereditary right.
have been looking after the duties for the past
5 years in obedience to the orders of Government.
do not wish that Tirunarayana Iyengar should proceed
ith his suit. The Office may be registered in his
ame. I have no children male or female. This appoint-
nt was first given to my brother and subsequently
me. As the right to the office does not belong to
, but belongs to Tirunarayana Iyengar, I have no

no objection to his being appointed to look after the duties. None else has any right whatever to this office. It should be registered in the name of Tirunarayana Iyengar".

Accordingly the Amildar of the Sri--rangapatam Taluk in reporting the case for the orders of the Sub Division officer, French Rocks, recommended the recognition of the transfer of the office to the appellant, Tirunarayana Iyengar, as agreed to by Venkatnarasimachar. This recommendation of the Amildar was accepted by the Sub Division officer, French Rocks.

Order No.24 dated 5th April 1891.

4. Thereupon one Krishna Iyengar, the son of Kotnur Rangachar and nephew of Venkatnarasimchar above referred to, appealed to the Deputy Commissioner, against the above order of the Sub Division officer, on the ground that his deceased father had been permanently appointed Chicka Parpattegar of the Melkote Temple and that the office had been transferred to his uncle Venkatnarasima Char only as a temporary measure during his (Krishna Iyengar's) minority and that Venkat narasimachar, cannot, therefore resign the same in favour of Tirunarayana Iyengar, the appellant,

to the prejudice of his (Krishna Iyengar's) hereditary right. The Deputy Commissioner after hearing both parties passed an order to the effect that Cheluvaraya Iyengar lost all his lien on the appointment by his dismissal in 1863, and that his son, the appellant, Tirunarayana Iyengar cannot succeed on the strength of hereditary right. The papers were, however, once more referred to the Sub Division Officer, French Rocks, who was called upon to record his findings on the following points:- Dated 28-10-91.

(1) Whether Venkatanarasima Char is competent to transfer his appointment to an outsider.

(2) Whether the appointment does not vest in the Muzrai Department.

(3) Whether the son of Ranga Char should not have a hereditary claim to it.

5. The Sub Division officer, referred back these questions to the Amildar of Srirangapatam for enquiry. In the course of this second enquiry Venkatnarasima Char again deposed as follows:- Dated 25-11-91.

" The Baravard of the Chcka Parpattagarship of the Melkote Temple was in my name. I was suffering from stomach ache for the past 4 or 5 years. My brother's

brother's son KrishnaIyengar and others who are now in the court did not give me even a cup of water. I have neither children nor wife. I have ne right to give away my appointment to others. The office belongs only to KrishnaIyengar. I consented to transfer it to TirunarayanaIyengar, solely because KrishnaIyengar had not treated me with due consideration and respect."

The papers connected with the enquiry were submitted by the Amildar to the Sub-Division Officer who, in his turn, sent up the same for the orders of the Deputy Commissioner with the following record of his findings on the points raised in the Deputy Commissioner's order dated 28th October 1891.

1. TirunarayanaIyengar can claim no hereditary right to the office now.

2. Vencatnarasimhachar is not competent to transfer his appointment to TirunarayanaIyengar who must be considered to be an outsider.

3. The appointment rests entirely with the Muzrai authorities.

4. KrishnaIyengar, the son of Rangachar

Rungachar, has a preferential hereditary right to the Chickaparpattegarship of the Melkote temple, to Tirunarayanalyengar, the son of CheluvaRayalyengar.

6. Thereupon, the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Ranagaswami Iyengar passed the following order:- Dated 9-5-92.

"The facts will be found stated in the previous order and in the findings of the Sub-Division Officer. The pleader for appelant now contends that the post of Chickaparpattegar is a hereditary appointment. It is admitted that Parpattegars are not hereditary, but it is maintained Chickaparpattegars are. There is how-ever nothing in the records in support of this contention. Even if this be true I am afraid the petitioner, (2nd counter-petitioner or respondent) cannot succeed. It is admitted that his father was dismissed on his failure to join Gangadharaeswaraswami temple. This order has not been set aside. The petitioner is now 29 years old and he did not take any action till 1886 or till after he was over 22 years of age (according to

It appears his first petition is dated 1887.

to his pleader). It is alleged that the petitioner's guardian had carried on the proceedings which stopped on his death many years ago, and the petitioner's application should be treated as a continuation of the same. The said proceedings have not even been filed in this case, and I am of opinion, therefore, that the petitioner's claim is time-barred.

"It is not denied that 1st counter-petitioner was not competent to resign his appointment in favour of any one or that the Muzrai Department was at liberty to reject such resignations.

"For these reasons, it must be held that 2nd counter-petitioner has no right to the appointment, and the order of the Sub-Division Officer, recognising such right should be set aside.

"No orders need be passed in this case as regards the filling up of the appointment."

7. Tirunarayanaiyengar, son of Cheluvarayaiyengar, now appeals to Government against the above order of the Deputy Commissioner, on

on the grounds set forth in his English petition which is herewith submitted.

10-7-93. (Sd). A. Srinivassacharlu.

Note by the Muzrai Secretary.

The Parpattegars' appointments (whether Head Parpattegar or Chickaparpattegar) are not hereditary. This is evident from the transfer of the Office-holders form one place to another. A printed copy of the circular lately issued on the subject is also put up herewith.

Intd. A.S.

If as decided by Government, in para 2 of Muzrai Proceedings dated 19th April 1892, the appointment of Parpattegar in a temple is <u>not</u> hereditary, the appellant's claim is inadmissible, But apart from that question appellant's father was dismissed in 1862 and appellant remained quiet for several years even after he attained majority and claimed the office in May 1887 and obtained the consent of the them C.Parpattegar to the transfer of the appointment in his (appellant's) name. That consent was apparently obtained collusively. Be this as it may

such consent is not binding on Krishna Iyengar.

If the appointment was not hereditary the Muzrai Officer was competent to nominate any person to the office and neither appellant nor Krishna Iyengar had any claims to the office.

In either view I would reject the present appeal.

(Intd) T.R.A.T.,
10-7-93.

To

The Hon'ble P. Chentsal Rao.

I think so too, but let us give a hearing to the petitioner.

(Intd) P.C.R.,
13-7-93.

Issue notices

Hearing 28th September 1893.

Sd/ A. Sreenivassa Charlu,
14-7-93.

Notices issued
18-7-93.

Adjourned to 16th November 1893.

Refer applellant to a regular suit.

Intd/ T.R.A.T.
16/11

This case was accordingly heard by Messrs. Thumboo Chetty and Chensal Rao and it was decided in Govt. Progs. No. 573-74/Muz.F.46-93 dated 28th November 1893 that important cases like these could not be settled on miscellaneous petitions and that the appellant should therefore establish his right by a regular suit before a competent authority. An endorsement was accordingly issued to the appellant Tirunarayana Iyengar.

Before the final decision of the case as above it appears from the records that Venkatanarasimhachar had his Baravard of Chicka Parpettagar transferred to the name of Kotnur Krishnaiengar and was however doing the duty himself as his substitute, the latter being employed as a school master at Melkote. The Baravard was, at the recommendation of the Sub Division Officer of French Rocks, retransferred to the name of Venkatanarasimhachar as Krishnaiyengar continued to hold the school Master's post (vide Muzrai Secretary's Rubkari No.C.32/621 dated 26th November 1895.)

(*) The original design was "Chikkapurapa but on the revision the Taalak Patti it changed to "Valagudi Parpathiga"

This arrangement continued till 1901.

On the 26th April 1902 a petition was received in this office from one Tirunarayaniengar of Melkote, stating that he was the Hukdar for the (*) Valagudi Parpettagar's

post, held by one Venkata Narasimhachar who was old and infirm. This petition was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, to report (i) whether the permanent incumbent Venkatanarasimhachar was able to carry on the duties (ii) whether there was any competent Hakdar to replace Venkatanarasimhachar and (iii) whether the petitioner Tirunarayana Iyengar had any right to the said post.

In October 1901, another petition was received from the same man, alleging that at the request of Venkatanarasimhachar, the permanent incumbent, his son (Krishniengar) was appointed by the Sub Division Officer as Valagudi Parpettagar. This petition was also forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner in continuation of the Rubkari on the subject and he was requested to fully explain the circumstances which led the Sub Division officer to make this new appointment in spite of the fact that a report had been called for by Government in the Rubkari referred to in para 1 above.

On the 12th October 1901, another petition on the same subject was received from cer--

certain residents of Melkote, complaining against the action taken by the Sub Division Officer in having made the appointment as requested in the Yadi from the Parakala Mutt. This petition was also referred to the Deputy Commissioner for early submission of the report already called for.

In reply, the Deputy Commissioner forwarded a copy of the Sub Division officer's report to him, wherein the Sub Division officer had explained that the vacancy was temporarily filled up pending enquiry into and disposal of the claims put forward by, several persons for the office in order to provide for the due performance of the duties pertaining to it without unnecessary break; that the incumbent temporarily appointed by him is the son of his predecessor and as such was the best eligible person for officiating in the post while the question of Huk was under enquiry; that the Parakala Mutt at Mysore had represented that the Huk to the said office belonged to it and that the post should be conferred on the person whom it selected; that other persons had also put in their claims, which were being enquired into; and that on the completion of the enquiry the result would be duly reported. This was recorded with the remark that further report was awaited (vide Govt Progs

Proceedings No.1026/Muz.F.150-92 dated 11th January 1902).

On the 28th January 1902 a telegram was received to the address of the Dewan from one Ramanujamuni Narsimhachar, which ~~runs~~ ran as follows:

" Petition follows Sub Division placed whole "Melkote Temple records with Parakala Mutt gumasta "fear forgery, substitutions, destruction. Kindly " cancel orders immediately ."

The Dewan's orders on the telegram ~~are~~ as follows:-

" What is this about? Why should all "the records be entrusted to Parakala Mutt?"

A petition has ,as stated in the telegram, since been ~~recorded~~ received from Ramanujamuni Narasimhachar and others, in which the petitioners state:-

i. That this is an appeal against the orders* of the Sub Division Officer of French Rocks.

* Nos.247/1-10-01 and 231/6-1-02.

ii. That the Govt. have already decided in their Camp No. 132-956 dated 26th November 1895, that one of the two Chicka Parpettagars' posts in the temple was unnecessary and that the present

.ncumbent holding the said appointment is not a hukdar.

iii. That the agent of the Parakala Mutt addressed a letter to the Sub Division Officer stating that the Chicka Parpettagar's appointment was at the Mutt's disposal and that the sole ~~contract~~ control over the Muzrai institutions in the State vested in the Mutt and that the Sub Division officer without any enquiry whatever acted upon that letter of the Mutt's Agent and accordingly issued orders on the 1st October 1901.

iv. That they petitioned this office as well as the District and the Sub Division officers, protesting against the alleged right of the Parakala Mutt, and that the Sub-Division officer has thereupon issued an order (231 dated 5th January 1902) directing the temple authorities to entrust the temple records to the representative of the Parakala Mutt and give him such of the papers as are pointed out by him.

v. And that this order of the sub Division Officer is partial, unauthorised and prejudicial to the other party .

The petititoners therefore pray that the order of the Sub Division officer may be cancelled and that, as all the local officers are partial to one party, the case may be decided either by Government or by any Judicial Officer.

No orders have been issued from this office about

about entrusting the Temple Records to the Matt's Gumasta.

Submitted to the Dewan.

The report called for from time to time regarding the new appointment of KrishnaIyengar as Valagudi Parpattegar has not yet been received from the Deputy Commissioner. An intermediate report was recently received stating that KrisnaIyengar had been appointed only temporarily and that enquiries were being made into claims and a final report would be submitted. That report is awaited Reference is casually made in the Sub-Division Officer's letter to the fact that the Parakala Matt claims to have the selection for the Valagudi Parpattegar's post and it is stated that that point also is being enquired into. For a full understanding of the case, the original records are required.

The Parakala Matt's Gumasta referred to in the telegram must be either the man who receives "Theertha" on behalf of the Matt or the man called "Matha Mudre" who puts the Matt's seal

seal on the temple door etc.

If, as alleged in the petition, the Sub-Division Officer has permitted the Matt Gumasta to search for papers in the temple records, I think that such an order is objectionable and that he may be asked to cancel his order immediately.

4-2-02. Intd. L.A.

The above orders were communicated to the Deputy Commissioner, who, in his letter No 308 dated 7th April 1902 states that the records of the Melkote temple were not entrusted to the Gumasta of the Sri Parakala Swami Matt as alleged in the petition. From the Sub-Division Officer's docket No. 634 dated 31st March 1902 to the address of the Deputy Commissioner (copy of which has now been received with the Deputy Commissioner's letter under reply) it is observed that no such order as is referred to in the complaint petition was issued to the subtaluk or to the temple Peiskar; but that copies of certain records were applied for by the Matt Agent and that they were directed to be give.

"and may lead to further comlications and troubles. An unconcerned and a disinterested public official must be asked to search the record."

(Intd). P.N.K.
17-2-02.

In this office letter No. 1262-63 d. 21st Feb. 1902.

th Mar. 1902. In a subsequent petition received from the same petitioners, they stated that only such of the records as were in support of the Sri Parakala Matt's claim were sent for by the local Officers, but that the petitoners' request to grant certain copies in support of their contention, was refused to be complied with, although they (petitioners) intimated the number and date of the orders whose copies were thus applied for. The petitioners also begged that the matter might be heard and disposed of by this office, and that the orders of the Sub-Division Officer regarding the appointment of the Matt's man as the Valagudi Parpattegar, might be held in abeyance, pending decision of their appeal.

The above petition had also been sent to the Deuty Commissioner in continuation of the previous letter on the subject. The Deputy Commissioner has returned the petition with his docket No. 316 dated 15th April 1902, wherein he states that the report on the subject has been submitted with his docket No. 308 dated 7th April

1902 (referred to above).

The report on the result of the enquiry regarding the claim of the Sri Parakala Matt, as already called for has not yet been received in this office.

Submitted to the Dewan for perusal.

The Deputy Commissioner's letter goes to show that the records were not, as stated by the petitioners, entrusted to the Agent of the Parakala Matt. The other statement made by the petitioners that copies asked for by them were not given has not been touched in the Deputy Commisioner's letter. The petition itself seems to be the outcome of malice on the part of the petitioners towards the Parakala Matt or its agent. It does not therefore appear necessary to refer back the papers to the Deputy Commissoner for information on the point omitted in his letter.

24-6-02. Intd. M.S.

As far as I can see this requires no orders.

18-7-02. Intd. P.N.K.

File.

21-7-02. Intd. L.A.

The records of enquiry ~~noted in page 1/~~ referred to above ~~of this note~~ has now been received with the Deputy Commissioner's No. 430 dated 20th May 1905. From the records it is observed as follows:-

Besides a Peishkar on Rs. 25/ two Chick-Parpattegars on Rs 4 each have been provided for in the revised Tasdik Patti of the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote. In the year 1901, Venkatanarasimhachar, one of the Chick Parpattegars died, and his adopted son, one Krishnaiyengar, was temporarily appointed to the vacant place by the Sub-Division Officer. He continued in the appointment for about a year, and then died. This fact having been brought to the notice of the Deputy Secretary to Government in charge of the Muzrai Department, he wrote to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District in April 1903, requesting to be furnished with his opinion as to whether the appointment of a separate Chicka-Parpattegar to the vacant post was necessary and whether that opportunity might not be availed of to do away with the vacant post altogether, the pay thereof being utillsed towards granting some

some increase to the other Chicka-Parpattegar Srinivasaramanujalyengar who was petitioning to Government in the matter.

The Deputy Commissioner has now replied to the above communication forwarding the report of the Divisional Assistant Commissioner Mr. K. Srinivasa Rao on the subject. In this report, the Assistant Commissioner after saying that it is necessary there should be two Chick-Parpattegars for the responsible supervision of the temple, states that there are four applicants for the vacant post, one of them being the daughter-in-law of the last permanent holder of the appointment, two others great-grand-son and grand-son-in-law of the last sole Parpattegar Singaperumallyengar who died in 1833, and the remaining one being the other surviving Chicka-Parpattegar of the temple. The Assistant Commissioner discusses their merits at length and recommends that one of them by name Singlachar (grand-son-in-law of Singaperumallyengar), retired 2nd Grade Pleader, and the present Manegar of the temple, may be appointed Chicka-Parpattegar, in the

No.430 d. 20th May 1905.

the place of the deceased Venkatanarasimhachar, as being a learned and an orthodox Brahmin, and that the other Chicka-Parpattegar given some increase of pay, and for this purpose, proposes to utilise the savings of Rs7-8-0 accruing annually for the past two years owing to the non-performance of "Mukhaveenedamayi" and "Doddatala" services in the temple. The Deputy Commissioner merely expresses concurrence with the Assistant Commissioner in so far as the appointment of Singlachar to the vacant post in question is concerned.

In the report, the Assistant Commissioner also brings to notice that the Parakala Matt lays claim to the privilege of nominating Chicka-Parpattegars for the temple, but that the Swami has not produced any documentin support of the claim, though ample time had been given to him for the purpose.

All the above proposals made by the Assistant and Deputy Commissioners have been based on the assumption that the office of Chicka-Parpattegar is not a hereditary one. The only orders

orders issued from this office on the subject are those contained in Govt. Pro. No. 77-85, dated 19t April 1892, where the non-hereditary nature of the Parpattegar's post is settled once for all. But the Proceedings do not make any explicit reference to the hereditary or non-hereditary character of the Chick-Parpattegar's appointment. One of the applicants Tirunarayanaiyengar by name, great-gran son of the late Singaperumal Iyengar referred to above, has been petitioning the Assistant Commissioner and to this office claiming the vacant post On a former occasion, when the latter had appealed on a miscellaneous petition to the Government, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner deciding against his claim, the committee of the council had decided that "important claims like these "cannot be settled on Miscellaneous petitions. The appellant should therefore establish his right by "a regular suit before a competent authority", to institute which, the Assistant Commissioner adds, the said applicant Tirunarayanaiyengar is now barred by limitation.

Submitted.

Since submitting the above note, a communication has been received from the Deputy Commissioner, forwarding a petition addressed to him by the agent of the Parakala Matt. In the petition, the agent says that the opinion expressed by the Assistant Commissioner in the Matter of th Matt's claim to nominate the Chicka-Parpattegar of the Melkote temple is one-sided, based as it is, he says, on a forged Sannad of 1829 and on th fact that the matt did not produce a genuine Sannad. The agent adds that he applied to this Office for a copy of the required document being furnished to him from the Shahanama register (in the Huzur records) and that it is no fault of the Matt if its application was not complied with.

ter No. 445 d. 2 May 1905.

The agent has submitted a similar petition to this office also, wherein he states that no opportunity was given to the Matt by the Sub-Division Officer to prove its claim by documentary evidence and prays therefore that the records may be referred back to the Deputy Commissioner for further enquiry.

3/4452 dated May 1905.

One Jeergudi Venkatanarasimhachar of

f Melkote and one Singi Perumallyengar, have al-
o petitioned to this office claiming the Parpatt-
egar's post in question.

This is so far as the history of the case is concerned.

The chief points now for decision are as follows:-

(1). Whether the Valagudi Parpattegar's appointment in question is a hereditary one as claimed by the petitioners, and if so, who is the proper claimant to be appointed to the vacant post. On page 8 of this note the late Muzrai Secretary Rai Bahadur Mr. A. Srinivassacharlu has recorded that "The parpattegars' appointments (whether Head Parpattegar or Chick-Parpattegar) are not hereditary".

(2). Whether two Chicka-Parpattegars are necessary.

(3). If the filling up of the vacant post be considered necessary, whether the right of nomination to the post rests with the Sri Parakala Matt as claimed by it on the strength of the Sannad of 1819, or whether the Sannad may be considered as having been cancelled by the subsequent Sannad said

said to have been granted in 1829 as alleged by the opposite party who have since produced the original copy through the Deputy Commissioner. The agent of the Parakala Matt argues that this is a forged document. When search was made for it in the Vernacular Records of the General and Revenue Secretariat, it is reported by the Vernacular record-keeper that no reference of it is forthcoming in the records.

Madurai Secretary's Remarks.

On the question of the hereditary nature of such appointments there are no hard and fast rules specifying distinctly what appointments are hereditary. In the Circular Orders (Standing Orders) Circular Dated [illegible] Outcaste Police Duties the duties of Pujaris of village deities are described as [illegible] the Civil Courts [illegible] Head Police Officers [illegible] Deputy Superintendents [illegible] Heads of Village Police. The right of hereditary succession [illegible] the Pujaris [illegible] Kestrams [illegible] Inspector Police [illegible]

-pear to have been continued from father to son with the view of creating an interest in the servants in their work and having also reference to the fact that the pay given was very small and there was no arrange-ment for the grant of pensions in old days. In the Proceedings of Government in the Mazrai Department No. 77-3 /Mir dated 28th April 1892, it was observed Sub J that the appointment of Parpatnegars in temples was hereditary and it was further directed that the [illegible] the son or the minor son or [illegible] of a deceased Parpatnegar should be discontinued in future. And again, Rai Bahadur M. Sreenivasa Charlu gave it as his opinion [illegible] under disposal that the Parpatnegar's [illegible] Head Parpatnegar or Chief Par-[illegible] hereditary, vide para 8 of this [illegible] T [illegible] present case on [illegible] appointed [illegible] under [illegible] hereditary. [illegible] also [illegible] [illegible] I [illegible]

ng ai Sri Vaishnava Brahmin) [illegible] 1862 he was transferred to the [illegible] temple at Sreerangapatam, [illegible] pensed with by the order of the [illegible] Ashtangam Devasthanam [illegible] by the Vedantam [illegible] of the Sri [illegible] Rangachar (a Vaishnava Brahmin) [illegible] the Office. [illegible] I [illegible] K [illegible] R [illegible] T [illegible] C [illegible] P [illegible] M [illegible] U [illegible] G [illegible] D [illegible] A [illegible] F [illegible] R [illegible] S P [illegible] H [illegible]

...ra Parpathegar. Their chief arguments are contained ...

...he English memorandum dated 8th March 1902, appended Slip K

...ner's petition to the Assistant Commissioner. They ...

...their claim upon an Adalat Patti of the Melkote tem- Copy Slip L

...ple in the list March 1815 prescribed by H. H. the Maha ...

...Krishna Raja Wodeyar Bahadur III, in which it is ...

...[illegible] charges on account of Pa- ...

...[illegible] the Mark ... should ...

...[illegible] The Sword of the Sri Para- ...

...[illegible] Archaka [illegible] ... Copy Slip M.

...[illegible] H. H. Maharaja Krishna Raja- ...

...[illegible] Archaka Atti [illegible] ...

...[illegible] ...

...[illegible] ...

...[illegible] ...

...[illegible] ...

at the management thereof should vest

tirely with Government Officers. The M

pugns the genuineness of

forgery. The document

and contains 4 or 5 lines

H. H. the Maharaja Krishna Raja Wadiyar Bahadur

It may also be stated that the

the Chicka Parpathegar's appointment is to manage the

affairs of the temple in immediate subordination to the

Pesikar and for such a post a person competent to conduct

[illegible] should be appointed by Government and not at

[illegible] Mutt.

Under these circumstances it is my humble

[illegible] Mutt may be informed that the deceased's

[illegible] have to [illegible] their claim to make any

Mutt[illegible] [illegible] in the

[illegible] cannot be accepted by Govt.

A [illegible] Government

[illegible] Chicka Parvatheegar now order dis-

[illegible] and treat the Chicka Par-

[illegible] and Bandar Greenivasaperia

[illegible] Esta-

[illegible] 00 [illegible]

[illegible] S [illegible] R [illegible] A [illegible] Commission [illegible]

[illegible] applicants [illegible] I

[illegible] prevent [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] P [illegible]

[illegible] all the [illegible]

ncrease the pay of the present in-

cumbent from Rs. 4 to Rs. 7 per mensem. The C[illegible]

of equal position to do [illegible]

likely to [illegible] agree [illegible]

In the [illegible] Man [illegible]

[illegible] the Case P[illegible]

Pro[illegible].

[illegible] consented [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Bi[illegible]

A[illegible]

[illegible]

part [illegible]

115 [illegible]

[illegible] Bhaktavatsara Rao

The post of Chicka Parpatheyar in Melkote Temple is not a hereditary one. I would accept the recorded opinion of Rao Bahadur Srinivasa Charlu on this point. There is sufficient corroboration

in the fact that the post has been held by different persons since 1862 - and hereditary has ~~Claim~~ is inconsistent by its absence.

For the reasons stated by the Surgeon Secretary I would reject the claim of the Sri Parakala Swami to the right of nominating a man to the post.

Instead of abolishing the post which has led to the dispute I would accept the recommendation of the Asst & Dy Commrs & Conferr the right (without any hereditary bar) on Singlachar -

1837
~~1618~~ 06
M'Nellie

115
Subd to the Dewan Sahib
16/8/06

16/8/06 — 2d Council

The Dewan comms with the 2nd Cr
Bo C&B 27/11/06

No 883 Em 1 Dt 27.5.1901

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಅಂಚೆ ಪೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಪಿನ್‌ಕೋಡ್

ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಸಮಯ ಮತ್ತು ಕಛೇರಿಯ ದಿನಗಳ ವಿವರ

ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಹುದ್ದೆ

ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಇಮೇಲ್ ವಿಳಾಸ

ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಭೌಗೋಳಿಕ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ

ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಸೇವೆಗಳು

ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಶುಲ್ಕಗಳು

ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಮಾಹಿತಿ

MUZRAI 114

1901

From

To The Dy Secretary to Govt Mysore Department

The Dy Commr,

Dated 16th Mysore Distt

Despatched 16th

Received 17th October 1901

General No. 585 & 586

Muzrai F. No. 150-92

Enclosure No. 1

Sir,

In continuation this office Rukkani no 883 dated 27th may 1901, in re the appointment of Valagu Parpathegar in the Sri Nara-nasimha Temple at Melkote I am directed to forward herewith another petition (no 330 dated 8th October 1901 from Seiga Hatha Srinivasa-niengar of Melkote, [illegible]-

MGCPB.-11-1-1901-1500

for the said ~~appointment~~

A detailed report

regarding this post, ~~of~~ originally

~~vaithiyanathapuram~~, held by one

venkata narasimhachar, was

called for in the Rubkari

cited above but it has

not reached this office till now -

The petitioner, in his

present petition, alleges that,

at the request of the said

venkatanarasimhachar his

son was lately appointed by the Sub-Division Officer as

village Paripathiyur. ~~in place~~

If his allegation ~~enclosed~~ be

true, the circumstances which

led the Sub-Division Officer

to make this new appointment in spite

~~of~~ of this Office

Rubkari on the subject, should also be fully

explained at an early

date

Yours

Dy. Secy.

18/10/61

2nd Reminder

MUZRAI

1901

From

To The Dy Commr
Mysore Dt.

Dated 5th
Despatched 6th Dec 1901
Received
General No. 803
Muzrai F. No. 150 - 92
Enclosure No. one

In continuation of this Office letter no 585 Muz 7150-9 dd 16th Oct 1901, in re the appointment of Valagiya Parapattegar of the Sri Narayanaswamy Temple at Melkote, has the honor to forward herewith another petn Regd No 398 dd 12th October last received from the residents of Melkote complaining

MGCPB--11-1-1901—1500

against the action taken by the Sub Dist Officer of French Rocks in the matter and to request that the report called for in this office letter referred to above may be expedited.

By order

4/12/16

By Secy

Irrig Dept

1901-1902

FROM N. Venkata Rao Esq
Sub Division officer
Erode Taeko

To H. Ramanuja Iyengar Esq
Offg Deputy Commissioner
Salem District

Dated 14th November 1907
Despatched 16-11-07
Received

General No. 834
No.

Enclosure No.

His memo No 90 dated 21st October 1901 forwarding copy of Government letter No 585 dated 16th October 1901, calling for explanation as to why the Vacant post of Valagudi Parapattegar in the Sri Varadaraja Swami temple at Melkote was filled up in spite of Government Prohibition on the subject.

Has the honor to report in reply that the Vacancy referred to in the above was only temporarily filled up pending enquiry into and disposal of the claims

put forward by several persons for the
in order to provide for the due performance
duties pertaining to it without unnecessary brea
The present incumbent temporarily appointed b
the undersigned is the son of his predecessor a
as such is the best eligible person for officiating
in the post while the question of hak to it is un
enquiry The Parakala mutt at Mysore has
represented that the hak to the said office belon
to it and that the post should be conferred on th
person whom it selects for it Other persons hav
also put in their claims which are being enquir
into on the completion of the enquiry the resul
will be duly reported.

(Signed) P. Srinivasa Row
for Assistant Division Officer,
French Rocks

"Copy"

for Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

CENTRAL
Date
REG. No. 374
MUZRAI RANCH

118

190/-02

FROM A. Ramanuja Iyengar
Offg Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To K. Anantasami Rao Esqr
Deputy Secretary to the Govt. Bpt.
Comparative
Muzrai Department

Dated 5th
Despatched 7 December 1901.

Received

General No. 127
No.

Enclosure No. one.

Deputy Secretary's docket
No. 585 dated 16th October
1901.
M.J. 15 02

Referring to the above has
the honor to forward herewith
copy of docket No. 334 dated
14th January last from the Hindu
Rocks Sub-Division officer
explaining the circumstances
under which the post of
Valagadi Pattegar in
the Sri Narayanaswami
temple at Melkote has
been temporarily filled up

Munsiff
in the Sub-Division
Mysore District

9/12/01

Refer
RS

Submitted for orders
RS

Record & say that further reports
after the Enquiry is completed
KR 7/1/02

order

Mysore.

119

Read:—

Docket No 128 of 5th Dec. 1901, from the Dy Commr, Mysore Dt forwarding Chief of Tenth Rocks Sub Dy Officer's Communication No 334 of the 14th Nov. last, reporting with reference to the Valagudi Parpathegar's post in the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote, that the vacancy was temporarily filled up pending enquiry into & disposal of the claims put forward by several persons

for the Office in order to provide for the due performance of the duties pertaining to it, ~~that the claims of the Sri Parakala matt for the Hak to the said Office and also~~ and the claims in Question ~~of other persons to it~~ are being enquired into and that on the completion of the enquiry - the result will be duly reported.

Order thereon No.

Recorded. No 1026 Tmr 7 150, 92

2 We promised further report Dated 11 January 19 after the enquiry

is completed is awaited.

25/1/42

Dy Secretary
Mucs. Deptt

to,
The Dy Commr.
Mysore Dt.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪೂಜ್ಯಾಪಾದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರ ಮಠದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ 128

ಶಾಸನದ ಪ್ರತಿ ———

ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಶಾಸನವು ಮಠದ ಪಟ್ಟಾವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪದ್ಯಾಕ್ಷರಗಳಲ್ಲಿದೆ

ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡದ್ದು ———

1347

1347
28-10-1

ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಪಟ್ಟಾವಳಿಯ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಬರಲು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪಟ್ಟಾವಳಿಯ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಪೂಜ್ಯಪಾದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರು ಶ್ರೀ ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಕಾಲದಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮತ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರೋಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯ ಪಟ್ಟಾವಳಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಸಂಕ್ಷೇಪವಾಗಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವದಲ್ಲದೆ ಚಿಕ್ಕಹಿಂಚಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇರೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಕಾಲದ

ಬಂದವಿರುವರಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ದುರಿತಾಳ್ಯನಿಸಿ ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಕಾಲ್ಯಾಕಲ್ಪಾಲಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವ ಧರ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂಟಕವುಂಟಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವರು ಪರಿಪರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೊಂಡಾಗ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ರಾಜಾಧಿರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜ ಒಡೆಯರವರು ಸಂಪ್ರೀತರಾಗಿ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವರ ಧರ್ಮಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ರಾಜಾಧಿರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜ ಒಡೆಯರವರು ಸ್ವತಃ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಕಾರ್ಯವು ಒಂದು.

ಇದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇನ್ನು ಬಹಳಷ್ಟಾರುವಿಶೇಷಗಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬರೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ಥಳಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮುಂದಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ರಾಜಾಧಿರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜ ಒಡೆಯರವರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಅವರ ಕಾಲಾನಂತರ ಆಗಿರುವಂಥವು. ಆದರೆ ಅವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ರಾಜಾಧಿರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜ ಒಡೆಯರವರ ಆಶೀರ್ವಾದದಿಂದಲೇ ಆಗಿರುವಂಥವು ಎಂಬುವುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವರಿಂದಲೂ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ರಾಜಾಧಿರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜ ಒಡೆಯರವರು ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಕೆಲವರ ವಾದವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲದೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಅನೇಕ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವರಿಂದಲೇ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವಂಥವು. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಶ್ರೀವೈಷ್ಣವರಲ್ಲದವರಿಂದಲೂ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ

12. oktober. 1901

Dpt- wo No. [illegible]

123

1262 En 2
Mur 7150.92

No 1263
Mur 7150-92
21st February '02.

To

The Deputy Commr
Mysore District

Dated 21st February 1902

Sir,

In continuation of
my Govt- Endt no 1026
Mug 7 150-92
dated 11th January 1902, I
am directed to forward
for favour of full report
herewith Telegram dated
28th ultimo and Letter
no 2257 dated 30th idem,
from Ramanujamma
Narasimhachar and
others of Melkote, Complain-
-ing that [illegible]

Officer of Tirunelveli-Rocks

has issued an order,

directing the Temple authorities

at-Nellaiappar to entrust-~~all~~

the Temple records to the

Guardians of the Sri

Parankusa swami Mutt,

with ~~the~~ view that he might-

-search for ~~many~~ papers

in support of the Mutt's

claims to have the -selection

for the Valayapathi Parthasarathy's

post- in the Sri Nellaiappa-

-swami Temple at-Nellaiappar.

2 .26, as alleged in

the petition, the Sub-Division

Officer has committed

the Mutt's Guardians to search

for papers in the Temple

records,

I am to observe that such an order is objectionable and may lead to further complications and troubles. ~~and~~ I am therefore to request that ~~you will~~ ~~ask the Indian Division~~ ~~Officer to consider his~~ ~~position~~ ~~accordingly.~~

~~2.~~ ~~An~~ unconcerned and disinterested public Official ~~would~~ may be asked to search the records, and a report submitted to this Office as to the action taken.

I have &c

Denison's compliments

21/2/07

Deputy Secretary

Inspector [illegible]

126

MUZRAI

1901

From

To The Dr Commr
Mysore Dl.

Dated 7th April 1902

Despatched 8th

Received

General No. 1561

Muzrai F. No. 150-92

Enclosure No. One

In continuation
of this Office letter No.
1262 dated 26th March 1902
Muz: 7150-92
in re the Valagudi Parpattegar
post in the Sri Narayanaswami
temple at Melkote
has the honor to forward
herewith another petn.
from the residents of
Melkote on the subject
and to request that
the submission of

MGCPB—1-1-1901—1500

the report already
called for may be expedited

12th By order

5/4/02

Dep Com
Mun. Depts

SCANNED

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date
REG. No. 73
MUZRAI BRANCH

2257 R
31-1-1952

Rs. Two
Regd. Stamp

Two Rupees
affixed

31-1-52

2257

30-1-1912

ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿ.

ಸಮಯ ಮುಗಿದ ನಂತರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಲು ಸಮಯ ಮುಗಿದ ನಂತರ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸಮಯ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಲು ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸಮಯ ಬೇಕಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿ.

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಲು ಸಮಯ ಮುಗಿದ ನಂತರ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸಮಯ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಲು ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸಮಯ ಬೇಕಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿ.

(೧೦)

LAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local Book

From
Station

Words | By | Hour | Minute | OFFICIAL INSTRUCTIONS

Person) | From (for)



RECD FROM L N. | SENT TO L N

AT Hrs. Mts By | A. Hr Mt By

Postmaster.

The address (including name of Sender) is transmitted

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.	
Deferred Message	.. 8 Annas	.. 1 Anna.	A gr less reckoned word.
Ordinary "	.. 1 Rupee	... 2 Annas.	
Urgent "	.. 2 Rupees	4 Annas.	

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 Miles.



133

189

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

to forward herewith, in original the correspondence ending with the deputy Amuktdar's No. 149/45 dated 9.3.02 from which it will be seen no such order as is referred to in the above was to the Sub Collector or to the temple peshkar. Copies of records were applied for by the mutt agent and it were directed to be given.

The enclosures of his memo under reply are herein returned.

P. Srinivasachar
Subdivision officer
Frenchrock

Copy

[illegible]
for deputy Commissioner
Mysore

ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 186
27-1-02

ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ

ದಿನಾಂಕ 8-3-90

ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ
149
452

9012
11-3-02

9-3-02

No 467

2547

Shukul Dutta

1902

FROM A. Ramanuja Ayyangar Esq
Offg Deputy Commissioner
Trichinopoly District

To L. Anantasamy Esq B.A. L.T.
Deputy Secretary to Govt. Revenue Department

Dated 5th April 1902

Despatched 7th April 1902

Received

General No. 308
No.

Enclosure No. 1

Adverting to para 2 of the Deputy Secretary's letter No. 1262, dated 21st March 1902, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Trichinopoly Rockfort Division Officer's docket No. 634 dated 29th March 1902 together with its enclosures.

It will be seen from the Deputy Amildar's report No. 147 dated 7th March 1902, that the records of the Srirangam Temple [illegible] to the Cauvery after the Panakalasamarpanam with a view to search for the papers in support of [illegible]

claims to make the selection for the Kalagudi Pe[illegible]
post.

[illegible]

[illegible]
In deputy commissioner
Anjore district

V10

for orders

with previous papers

13/8/02

ਸਾਰੇ ਜੀਵ ਜੰਤੂ ਦਾ ਨਿਰਮਾਤਾ ਨੇ ਕੁਝ ਨੂੰ ਵੱਡਾ ਕੁਝ ਨੂੰ ਛੋਟਾ ਕੁਝ ਨੂੰ ਮੋਟਾ
(ਮੋਟੇ ਨੂੰ) ਕੁਝ ਨੂੰ ਪਤਲਾ (ਲੰਬੇ) ਨੂੰ ਕੁਝ ਨੂੰ ਕਾਲਾ ਕੁਝ ਨੂੰ ਚਿੱਟਾ
(ਨੂੰ) ਕੁਝ ਨੂੰ ਕਾਲਾ ਕੁਝ ਨੂੰ ਚਿੱਟੀ ।
ਸਭ (ਸਾਰੇ) ਜੀਵ ਜੰਤੂ ਦਾ ਨਿਰਮਾਤਾ ਨੇ ਵੱਖ ਵੱਖ ਸੁਭਾਅ ਦਾ ਬਣਾਇਆ
ਹੈ ਕੋਈ ਕਿਸੇ ਨਾਲ ਨਹੀਂ ਮਿਲਦਾ ਜੁਲਦਾ ਹਰ ਇੱਕ ਦਾ ਸੁਭਾਅ ਵੱਖ ਵੱਖ

12/3/1902.

1437

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 17-4-1902
REG. No. 7464
N'ULZRAI BRANCH

1/4/02

Rupees

Rs

17/4/02

Submitted with the

above note Continued

Rs

18/4/02

1902

From N. Ramanujayya Esq
Offg Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To L. Anantasamiah Esq B.A.
Deputy Secretary to Govt
Dated 15 } Mysore 15th
Despatched } April 1902
Received

General No. 316
No.

Enclosure No. One

Deputy Secretary's docket
No 1561 dated 7th April
150.92
1902 forwarding for an
early report another petition
from the residents of Melkote
in re the Valgudi Pathasala
post in the Sri Narayana
Swami temple at Melkote

Adverting to the above, I have the honor to state that the report called for in the above has already been submitted. See this office docket No 308 dated 7th April 1902.

2. The petition received

with the above is herewith returned.

1/45

Commissioner,
For Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

OFFICE OF THE JEWISH
MUSEUM
No. 786

956

132/956

This is the reply furnishing in details on several queries put by you in connection with a copy sent - the picture mentioned - kindly see the Dy. Supdt's order on letter no 535.

Manager

13/12/02

ఆ ఏ తారీఖు

11. ని కళ్ళు ఉంటే చూడు

(ఆ) [illegible] నేలు [illegible] నేల

[illegible] సూత్ర సత్తే [illegible]

శ [illegible] ఇళతళ్ళ సేవేదాళ్ళ

[illegible] తళ్ళ మీ సేవేయిరిలు

[illegible]

[illegible]

22/12/02

23/12/02

MUZRAI

19 —19

From

DEPUTY SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy: Commr
Mysore Dt

Dated

Despatched

Received 5th Dec: 1902.

General No. 1245
Muzrai F. No. 49-93
Enclosure No. 4

Etc No 00
717, 508, 317
1135

Has the honor to forward herewith the marginally noted petitions received in this Office, re Valapudi Pasupathegara - post in the Sri Narayanaswamy temple at Melkote and to enquire how the matter stands now

P. O. 1

Dy ecy
Muz Dept

MGCPB—2,000—7-6-02

d compliance

7/6/02 7/6/02

ಕಲ್ಯಾಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಇವರಿಗೆ

22-9-ರಂದಿನ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣ/535

ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಪಸಂಖ್ಯಾತ

ಕೋಡಸಿನ ಮಿಷನ್ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗೆ ನೀ-

ತಲ್ಲಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ಇಳ್ಳಿಗೆರೆಯ

ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಅಗತ್ಯತೆಗೆದ್ದ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿ ಪಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಆಡಳಿತಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾದ ಡಾ|| ಸಿ.ಆರ್.ಸಿ

ಸಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮೇರಿ ಅನಸ್ತಾಸಿಯಾ ರವರು

ಮೇಲಿನಿಂದ ಆದೇಶಗಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು

ಹೇಳಿ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ನಕಲಿಸಲು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ

ತಪ್ಪು ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರಿಂದ

ಬಾಲುವು ದಿನ್ನಿ-

ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ರೋಗಿಗಳಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಲವಾರು ಹಾಸಿಗೆಗಳು

ಖಾಲಿಯಿದ್ದು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರು ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲದೆ

ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ

ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯನ್ನು ಕಡಿತಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಅವರನ್ನು

ಹಾಸಿಗೆಗಳು ಭರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುವ ಇತರೆ

ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನಿಯೋಜಿಸಲು ಆದೇಶ

ರವನ್ನೊದಗಿಸಲು ಇದರಿಂದ ಕೋರಿದೆ

ಹಾಗೂ ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮಕೈಗೊಂಡು

ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಸಹಿ/-

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಮೀಷನರ್,

13/11/02

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 4-6-12
REG. No 1126
MUZRAI BRANCH

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
REC. INWD
Date 6-6-1931
MYSORE

15

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾನ್ಯರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾನ್ಯರಾಜ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾನ್ಯರಾಜ

5 / 157

జిల్లా కలెక్టరు గారికి
పరామర్శ

ముఖరాగ్ని ఇలాంటివి
వనాకష్ట లరిశాచ్ఛేదాలలో
బళ్ళారి 1901–1902 వరకు
ద 1130, 1120 రైతులు
ఇదరపు చేసులు దక్కకపోవడమే
గళ్ళు ఇసక ఇదరాంతరాల
కొత్త. మిలకండ అమలగళ్ళ
కాండ 19.10 1829 మరియు
వసనకోవడం అందక
ఇతరులకు ద్వారా. అందరి
రిపరిచి సంవత్సరదళ్ళు
బళ్ళారి అంచ ఇంక
మలదళ్ళు భరి పారవేయడం
నవకరించడం" కొరకు

వుదిగా

Revd & Comp Mysore
21. 6. 57

Ver. Records ; మే 26 ; 61
The Petitioner would
a copy of the Summons

of 1829. Kindly let
know whether the Samand
in question is available
in the Records.

[illegible]
23/6/02

[illegible]
605

[illegible]
18/7/02

Submitted

The petitioner may be
informed that unless
fuller description of the
Samand alluded to in his
petn is given or a copy of it
sent, the requisite information
cannot be obtained

19/8/02

21/8/02

ನಂ. 287 ಇ-1 ಕ್ಕೆ 24 ರ 1902

ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಕಾಗದವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಡವಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ಷಮೆಯಿರಲಿ.

ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸವೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಕೆಲಸ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಮುಗಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರುವೆನು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಕಾಗದ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗದು. ಕ್ಷಮೆಯಿರಲಿ.

ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಮುಗಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರುವೆನು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಕಾಗದ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗದು. ಕ್ಷಮೆಯಿರಲಿ.

ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸವೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಕೆಲಸ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಮುಗಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರುವೆನು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಕಾಗದ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗದು. ಕ್ಷಮೆಯಿರಲಿ.

ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಕಾಗದವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಡವಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ಷಮೆಯಿರಲಿ.

Yours truly,

Richard Hayward

Secretary

22/9/02

161

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 22-9-02
REG. No. S-350
MUZRAI BRANCH

Submitted for orders

Jr

22/9/02

709

Send this to the Record Keeper of the Vernacular

do of the Dewan's

dar for careful search being made the Sanad in question, and report at a very early date.

16.10.02

3 10 02

257.

ತುರ್ತುಪತ್ರಿಕೆ

1 Rifles

ಕೆ ಎ

3/10/02

ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ

ಸಹಾಯಕ

ಪೊಲೀಸ್

ಅಧೀಕ್ಷಕರು

28 10 02

ಸಹಾಯಕ

ಪೊಲೀಸ್

ಅಧೀಕ್ಷಕರು

ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ

13/11/02

165

1183 & 1184 dt
25/11/1902.

మెల్ల సూరుస్వామి సాక్ష్యనదము ప్రజూర్
దివాణ్ కచ్చేరిలో ముద్దాయిలు ఇరువురి
యెదుటను ఇలా
యిచ్చినది —

మెల్ల సూరుస్వామి వల్ల మరి
కాలసాక్ష్యము ముగ్గురి సాక్ష్యము తీసుకొనుట
కేతరఫులు రంగాచార్యులు గారు -

నెల్లూరు ప్రజూరి గారు ఫిర్యాదు
కొరకు ఇచ్చిన ఆర్డరు 22-9-1902 వ తేదీ మరియు
ముద్దాయి వకీలు గారి నంచి అప్పీలు
మెమోరాండం ఆఫ్ అప్పీలు ఇవ్వగా
వాటిని పరిశీలించి ఈ కోర్టు వారు 1902 సం/82వ
నెంబరు ఆర్డరు ఇచ్చిన 19 వ తేదీ మరియు
నన్ను "ఫిర్యాదు సాక్ష్యము తీసుకొని
ఒక్కొక్క సాక్ష్యమును ప్రత్యేకముగా ప్రత్యేక
తేదీలలో ముద్దాయి ఎదుట ఆ సాక్ష్యము తీసుకొని
రావలసిందిగా ఆజ్ఞాపించి వున్నారు. ఆ
ప్రకారం ఫిర్యాదు సాక్ష్యమును ప్రత్యేక
తేదీలలో ముద్దాయి ఎదుట తీసుకొని వచ్చి
ఇప్పుడు ముద్దాయి వకీలు గారు ఈ
సాక్ష్యములన్నియు ఒకే రోజున ఇప్పించ
మని కోరినందున ఆ ప్రకారం ఇప్పించుటకు
వీలు కలిగించుటకు ఆయన
కును వీలు కల్పించుటకు గాను ఆ ప్రకారం

వాగలాదేరుంబరోవి ఎప్పుడో
దిబ్బ బిన్న,బిందరువిశ్వ మూరరుఱు
వు వుండాలుపుకొర్కాగి తళ్ళి అధికారిగ
ళొళ్ళకారావు మూర్ఖదిబ్బ నకలన నకలే
(3) అసలొసనచ్చగళుమేలు అగిర ఆ
మెలరిక్క నిరూపవన్నుఘాతిగళిం
ట్టు వురఖూమ్మే ముంకాంద పుంవి
నాదళు అగిరుత్తే యెలు.

ఈ మెలితొండప్రుళ్ళిగళు గోఖూర్ణ
కీండుపుతళిరాంది గళకాణి వుూర్దద
లునాధ్యవాగి బ్బరి ఆధన్నిశ్రీకృష్ణాపి
గళనుగ్గా ఇల్లవాదళి అన్నధన్నిశ్రీకృష్ణా
పియున్న రళ్ళసి దళి వుంకిర్కాంబుళి
ళొంకాడ్రోన్నళ్ళప్రుడుంకిసి యూవబుస్స
ఆప్పుగోకీండిసలాంది కృతు తిళ్ళి యు
వుదు. బిక్కాతిళ్. ఏ వూండ్రేశ్వ
బుక్ సర్ 1902 రిన్ని దవి దర్ఖాగఱ్ఱం
నళ్ళుంత్.

బిజ్జూరి
13/11/62

చిల్ల ఆధనకొళ్ళ
ఫో పుళ్ళిపి పర్ర్రత్తుళ్
వుూళాంది ఇలాబు

R.O. 1184 Em?
Copy to be sent
to the Dy. Commissioner

Mysore Dt., with reference
his Rubkari no $\frac{10}{251}$ dated
21st October 1902, returning
11 enclosures



11/02 Dft.

Rv

OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
29-11-02
958

914

29/11/02

Vernacular Records

All the info you want is now given - Please kindly search now and let me have a reply soon - M

30/7/03

31/7/03

895

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸಿಆಸ್ಕ್ಯೂ ೨೦೬/೨೦೧೭ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ: 27 ನವೆಂಬರ್ 2017

ಸಂಪುಟ ಸಭೆಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿ

ಸಂಪುಟ ಸಭೆಯು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಕೈಗೊಂಡ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇದರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿದೆ.

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ. ವಿಷಯ

೧. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ಅಧ್ಯಾದೇಶ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ಅಧ್ಯಾದೇಶವನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೨. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೩. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೪. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೫. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೬. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೭. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೮. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೯. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೦. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೧. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೨. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೩. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೪. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೫. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೬. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೭. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೮. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೯. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೨೦. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1963 ಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ವಿಧೇಯಕ, 2017 ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಮುಖ್ಯ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

2/10

శ్రీ సుందరకాండ పారాయణ
రాయబడుతుంది

పిల్లలున్నవారు చదివినవారి నగళ
శ్రీ లక్ష్మీ గ్రహ. —

పిల్లలున్నవారు చదివినవారు
శ్రీ కిష్కింధ యుద్ధకాండ చదివినవారు
కాబట్టి కిష్కింధ యుద్ధకాండ పారాయణ
చేయుటకు నవరించినవారు శ్రీ
రామ పరివారానికి కావలసిన వస్తువులు
లేదా శ్రీ వాల్మీకి రామాయణం ఇవ్వబడుతుంది
26 వ్యక్తులకు / 829 రూపాయలు నివ్వవలసి
వారు 19 వ తేదీ సాయంత్రం వరకు
శ్రీ రామ భక్తి పాటలు పాడుకోవడం
లు లేదా [illegible]

అయ్యా

శివపత్నులు లక్ష్మీ లక్ష్మీ

నా తల్లియందు నా కెలాంటి చిత్తవృత్తి

నడతి కొంటిదో నీకు తెలియుట చేత

ఉచితము అనుకొన్నట్లు కొండలు

లక్ష్మీ కొన్ని కొంత తెలిపి

తేదీ ఫిబ్రవరి 1903

22/1/03

Dy Secretary to
Govt Mines
Department

22/1/03
27

జిల్లా ప్రత్యేక న్యాయాధికారి (ఎస్.సి. & ఎస్.టి. కేసులు) మరియు అదనపు సెషన్స్ న్యాయాధికారి, నెల్లూరు

(1) శ్రీ వి. వెంకటేశ్వర్లు, న్యాయవాది, నెల్లూరు వారు ఈ కార్యాలయ కోర్టు ధిక్కార కేసు నెం. 27.11.2021 లో ఈ కోర్టు ముందు హాజరై, తన బేషరతు క్షమాపణ పత్రాన్ని సమర్పించారు.

(2) ఈ కేసులో 25.11.2021 తేదీన ఈ కోర్టు ఇచ్చిన తీర్పులో, ఈ కోర్టు ధిక్కార కేసు నెం. 1183/2021 లో ఈ కోర్టు ఇచ్చిన ఉత్తర్వులను ఉద్దేశపూర్వకంగా ఉల్లంఘించినందుకు

VERNMENT
323
MUZRAI

1903-04 175

From The Deputy Commissioner Mysore District. —

To The Deputy Secretary to Government, Mysore Department. —

Dated
Despatched 3rd September 1903
Received
General No
No.

Enclosure No.

Refers
ks
7/9/03

Sir Grattan Bulkeley requesting to send the original Sanad of 1829, if available, relating to the appointment of Chick Puttaiya as the Sri Karya Nirvahakaru temple at Melkote.

MGOPB 50 reams—6-12-02

ತೀರ್ಪು ಪತ್ರ.

ಮೇಲಿನವರಿಂದ ಅಂಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿ—

ಮೇಲಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 31 ನೇ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ಕಿಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ —

1903 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯ

ಮೇ ತಿಂಗಳ

ಮುಲ್ತಾಫ್ ಖಾನ್

ಪೈಕಿ — ಹಿಜ್ಮತ್ ಜಹಾನ್ ಬೇಗಂ

ಮೇಲಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮೇಲಿನ ಹೆಸರಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. / 8 ರಾಜನ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ 124/51 ನೇ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸಿನ ಅನ್ವಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೊಡಲು ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಲ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಧ್ಯ ಠಿ

ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ಯರು ಸಂಚಾಲನ ಬೆಳೆ ಕೈಚಳಿ ಠಿ

ಠಿಚಳಿ ಸಳ್ಳಸಿಂಚ ಚಳು ಕಾಳ್ಳಿಳು ಎಂಬ ಮಲಾಳುಂಠಿ

ಲಲಲಲಲಾಗಾಳು ಸಾಕ ಮಾಳಿಳಿಲಂ ಠಿ

461
11-9-03

11/9/03

ఎ/141-3-ఆ-23 వేల్పనుంబుశాల్ల మీంబళలుగిరా
యుయులంగిళియుంద

శ్రీరంగశర్మ్మాణుశాలుంకులశ్రేమిలరిగ్
కీలల్లుల్లాలంపేవేల్లవనిద్రినదగ్గుత్రిపెళ్
లాగవేల్లకాగిలుల్పి వెళ్ళలుంల్లకాంభాంత్
ఏ శ్నిలంయుదక్షి యుల్లర్ధంలేనప్పుంతోగి
నిదరివేల్లవనిద్రినదగ్గు తరకింలన్లాంలు
నళ్ళలుత దవరిగిన్లాం శంత్రెళ్ళగిలనివిల్లగ్
వీంనులల్లిదచ్చిళుద్ధిలుదాంంభరంగ్లాం
నాంజిల్లశశటదుర్వరవరు 1829 కియునిం
లకొంచ్చశర్/19 కి నరియుంద విరిబర్ది
నంవత్సరద లాశ్చిగవళ్ళ నీంబళలుం
రదల్లు లిశికుచ్చివలుకెళులల్లో వే
లిలనగ్గలకల్లగాంతరిగే నీంబిళియు
దాంగిళలుందాందనవ్వినగ్గాంబయుళ్

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT
41
173

183

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.
Bangalore, 7th December 1903

8/12/03

Petition — as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, to

transferred to the Deputy Secretary to the Govt. Mysore, Muzrai Department for disposal.

No.
9729 4·1203

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

2 F4-93 10 1907

DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 972/941

dated 4 · 12 · 1903 ~~received at the Dewan's Office from~~ addressed to H. H. the Maharaja by Srinivasaramanujan of Melkote claiming the Chika Parapatya appointment in the Melkote Temple and another letter No 1165 on the same subject, ~~respecting~~ addressed to this Office by one Ramaswamiengar, are ~~is~~ forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~, to the Dy: Comr, Mysore District, in Continuation of this Office No 1355 Dy 21st November 1903.

By Order,

BANGALORE,

18 .

~~Muzrai~~ Secretary

185

18.9

రసంబళారి.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1704, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

1903 04

From R. K. Punkaravaddar, Esq.
Deputy Commissioner
[illegible]

To [illegible]

Dated [illegible]

Despatched [illegible]

Received

General No. [illegible]

No.

Enclosure No.

[illegible]

Rec'd
16/1/04
Ds

Draft submitted drawing the Dy Comr's attention to this Office Endorsement No 1355 dated 21st November '03 which was sent in reply to the Petition referred to in the present Communication

Ds
21/1/04

MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

ನಂ. 2184 ದಿ 28.1.04.
Muz. F-46/03.

ರೂಬಕಾರಿ

ಮೈಸೂರುಗೌರ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖಾ

ಬತಾ 26 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಜನವರಿ
190 4 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೊಕ್ತಂ
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Muzrai Secretary.

ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಶ್ರೀ ರಂಗನಾಥಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲವು ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗಿ 1829 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದ ಪತ್ರಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ದಿನಾಂಕ 31-8-03 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಸದರಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಹೊಸ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಲು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ

3334
MUZRAI SECT

1903-04

From
M. Kantaraj Urs Esqr: B.A.
Offg. Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
M. Shama Rao Esqr. M.A.
Offg. Secretary to the Govt.
of Mysore, in the Muzrai Depart.

Dated 21-04

Despatched June 1904

Received

General No. Rubakari No. 123
No.

Enclosure No. 6

Stating that the original Sanad cannot be obtained in the Sriranganatha Swami Temple at Sreerangapatna.

Mfes
Rs
25/6/04

No. 123

ಕರಾರುಚೀಟಿ

ತಮ್ಮಿಬ್ಬರಾಣ್ಯ ಅಮ್ಮಲಾಪುರಿ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ.

ಕೆಳಗಾಣಿಸಿದ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು $\frac{11}{21}$ ನೀವು ಅಂದಿ ಬರೆದ.

1904 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

ಮೇ ತಿಂಗಳ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಸ್ತಿ

ಮೊದಲಿಗೆ ಕೆಳಗಾಣಿಸಿದ

ಮೊದಲಿಗೆ ಕೆಳಗಾಣಿಸಿದ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು ಮತ್ತು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರೆದ ಕರಾರುಚೀಟಿ

ಮೇರೆ

ಪೂರ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇರೆ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು

ಪಶ್ಚಿಮಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇರೆ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು

ಉತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇರೆ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು

ದಕ್ಷಿಣಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇರೆ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು

ಮೇರೆ

ಪೂರ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇರೆ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು

ಪಶ್ಚಿಮಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇರೆ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು

ಉತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇರೆ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು

ದಕ್ಷಿಣಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇರೆ ಮೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನು

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 30-5 1914 [illegible] —

15/3
659 [illegible]

[illegible]

Through French Rock
Division Assistant
Commissioner

No. 119

13.604

MYSORE
3215.
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT

Submitted this
the Registrar

: 350 Encls 27 files R.B.C.
9:7:04.

రుంశకాంతి.

కొల్లలుల్లాలపేశ్రీనాంచారిగారు
మంచువరదిల్లవసిద్ధినదుల్లు త్రవ్వించి
యంగభిల్లకాశిద్ధ పుళలుంల్లకొంచా
కేశిళ్ళయుద మంచుల్లకొళ్ళుపున సిమింకిళ్ళ.
నదతిదిల్లవసిద్ధినదుల్లు త్రీశరకాల
నాం మిగళ్ళవరచలుతదవరిగళ్ళాంకెంచ్చే
లు
కెలధిల్లకొందు 1829నే యినవియ
లు కుప్పరకెళ్ళి లుదిలుదిన్నదుకెళ్ళుని
నకెళ్ళి విచారంగిచ్చినుంచులుతుళ్ళి
కెరవిందశంద $\frac{123}{3384}$ $\frac{119}{3215}$ కెళ్ళ
రురుంశకాంతిగళ్ళన్నుంల్లకలాంయిళ్ళ

త్రీన్నాశదల్లు రువలుదిలుదిన్నుదు
చ్చినుంకల్లయిరువలనిుంతినాంక

ధన్యవాదాలు.

ఇట్లు

By Order

17/7/04

Secretary to Govt

Mowrai Dept.

12/7/04



1904-05

From
M. Kantaraj Urs Esq: B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
C. Anantaswami Rao Esq: I.A.S.
Secretary to the G. of M. &
in the Mun. and Sp. Depts.

Dated 31st
Despatched August 1904
Received
General No. Rebates No. 14
No.
Enclosure No. 1 & 2

Forwarding the records connected with the Periakeri Sporting Rights

Ks

3/9/04 –
Submitted for orders.
9/9/04
M



No. 14

1904

రసీదు పత్రిక

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

తేదీ 27 నెలలు

1904 సం [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

ಪಲ್ಲವಿ ಸಿಂಚಾಲಕರಾದ ಆ. ಸುಂದರ್ ನಾ
ರಾಜೇಂದ್ರಾಚಾರಿ.ಸಿ ನಿವೃತ್ತರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ
ಸಾಧಿಕರುಗಳಾದ ರಾಜೇಶ್ವರಿ ಕಳೆದ ನಿವೃತ್ತರಾದ
ಸಾಧಿಕರುಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲಲಿತಾ ಸಿಂಗಾಚಾರ್ಯ
ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಪದ್ಮನಾಭಸ್ವಾಮಿರವರು ತೀರಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ
ಸಾಧಿಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಸುಲೋಚನಾ ಸಿಂಗಾಚಾರ್ಯ - ಅವರು
ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ
ಗೌರವ ಸದಸ್ಯತ್ವವನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ
ಸೇರ್ಪಡೆಯಾದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಾಗತ.

రంగశాయి -

మీర్లలోన్ల లేకేచ్చినాంచాం యిట్లుస్థాలియు
వరదీల్లవస్థిన వన్నగ్రిశిక్షీలిగ చన్లకాంగిర్స
కృళ్ళలోన్లకిరంభాంశీవిశాయిచయిల్లిన్నాంశే
నన్నిలాంశిగీనిదరిచీల్లవస్థిన వన్నగ్ల శ్రీవిరశా
లన్నాంలినళ్ళవరమతరవనిశిగ్రాంశ్రపత్రేన్ల
శీలచల 1829నేయినవియాల కుల్లారశిన్ల
లన్నలులన్నినాలు కాంబర్లశీలు లనినాంశ
గారస్త్రీయిలంగాంగ్రా-చీర్లల్లోలంచేర్లలో శీ
గీపువిద్రవాంన్లలిందమువీందాలంలు
మీశీంతరనీల్లశీంతచేర్లగా శీళ్ళలవాంగం
శ్లీ వవిందశిందలగ్నన్ని 31శీలుర్వళ్ళ 014/919
నీనంశరుర్యంశ్రీంనీంర్లీల లాయిశ
లన్నిలంగాంద్రాంశ్రీ చుళ్ళుంగాంచేర్లగా
శ్రీంర్లీ వంశీమశ్రీంగాలు లంలుసీశ్రీ

ఫ్లు: 1327 ఓ 1726
ఫ్లు: 7: 46-93

గ్రీ 4-10-04.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹಾಯಕ ಪ್ರಾಧ್ಯಾಪಕರ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಲು ಆದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ.

ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು

By order

28/9/04

Secretary to Govt

Higher Education Dept

202 1904-1905.

~~189~~

Refer
KS
22/5/05

From
H. H. Sparkes Esquire.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To
L. Anantanarayana Rao
Esqr B A
Secy: to Govt, Judl & Depts
Bangalore.

Dated 11th May 1905

Despatched 20 do

Received

General No. 430
No.

Enclosure No. 4 files
(1-120 pages c.
per Chanish)

Encls returned Nos.
Regd. post with Govt. D.O
Dt 2.3.07

States that Singala
char appears to be the
best fitted for the ap
-pointment of Vola
-gudi Patkallegara
post in the Taluk
of Srirangapatna

720 / 5-5-05 203

(1-20 papers as per Phoris Patty)

Copy of the Assistant Commissioners French Rocks, Dated 20th/30 April 1905.

Recd by Regr Post on 5-5-05.
Mem 3.
Sub Co.
Reg 4

From.

K. Sreenivasa Rao Esqre
Assistant Commissioner
French Rocks.

No 430 / avi: 4 files (1-20 papers each) & 1 plan

To

H. H. Sparkes Esqre
Deputy Commissioner
Ellpore District

From this report Lingola chain appears to be the best site for the appointment. This will be forwarded to the Lingola Sir,

H.H.Sparkes
11/5/05
Deputy Commr
Ongole District

Proceedings of Govt advertising to Government No. 1026 dated 11th January 1902 calling for a report on the claims of various individuals for the Volagudi Carpathegari Cost in the temple of Sri-Narayanaswami at Nellola, Copy received with Deputy Commissioner's memo no: 188 dated -
M.f. 150-92

dated 20th January 1902 and Nugarai Deputy Secretary's letter No: D. dated 8th April 1903 to the Deputy Commissioner requesting to be informed whether the appointment of a separate Carpathegar to the vacant post of Volaguoi — Carpathegar is necessary and whether this opportunity can be availed of, to do away with the vacant post altogether the pay thereof being utilized towards granting some increase to the pay of other Carpathegar, and received with Deputy Commissioner's Panarese yadi No: 397 of 29th April 903, I have the honor to state as follows:-

In the Vadek Pattu of Sri-Narayan Swamy Temple there was only one Chekka Carpathegar and the last office holder was Senga perumal. In the year Vyaya i.e about the year

office was split up into
two Chikkaparpathegarships. Accordingly
in the revised Jasdik Patti of 1900 there
are two Chickka Parpathegaro to the
Sri Narayanaswamy temple.

In December 1895 Venkatanarasimha
Char and Srinivasa Ramanujiengar
were the two Carpathegaro. In Febrary
1907 Venkatanarasimha Char died and
for this vacant post the following persons
laid claim.

A. Krishnaiengar as the adopted son
of the deceased Carpathegar Venkata
narasimha Char.

B. Sampathkumara char as the great-
grandson of Carpathegar Singaperumal
Iyengar who was the sole Carpathegar
in the year Siddarthi before the office
was split up into two Carpathegarships.

C. Veeraraghavaiengar as the grandson
of the brother of Singaperumal Iyengar
referred to in the above para.

T

D. Srinivasaramanujayyangar Co. Parpathe-
-gar who held the offices along with
the deceased Venkatarsemha char
on the score that for the last two
years he as the only Parpathegar
has been able to discharge the duties
of the combined offices satisfactorily
and that the vacancy need not be filled
up and the pay of the vacant appoint
-ment may be added to his pay.

I shall deal with the claims of
each of the above named person
separately,

Krishna Iyengar. This individual
was temporarily appointed in October 1901
to the post of Chikkaparpathegari
otherwise called as Volaguru Parpathe
-gar on the death of his adopted
father Venkatamarasimhachar. He
held the office till 1902 about which
date he died of plague. He has left
no issue and on behalf of his widow
Narasimhachar has appeared and
claims the office for her.

The

The Huzarai Secretary in his Rukkari camp no: 32/956 dated 26th November 1895 when Confirming the appointment of the deceased Venkatanarasimhacha as Chekkaparpathegar has distinctly stated that the office of Chekkaparpathegar is not hereditary and that the fact should be communicated in writing to the deceased Venkatanarasimachar The widow's Claim for the office is not therefore sustainable.

Sampath Kumalhar: This individual held the office of Manegar in Srinarayanaswamy temple up to the year 1903 when he died of Plague. On his death his appointment was conferred on his father retired 2nd grade Pleader Singalacharlu who continues to hold the office of Manegar and claims the vacant post on the score of being the husband of the grand daughter of Parpathegar Singaperumal who was the sole Parpathegar in Siddanti. He also urges that he

is now in possession of the Sālavasa and Bhattamangya grants of Parpathe-gar Sengaperumal Iyengar referred to above. This claimant is an elderly gentleman of acknowledged orthodoxy and reputed to be well read in the Sastras. In my humble opinion a well qualified and deserving claimant.

Theroonarana Iyengar. This individual held the office of Stānik in the Srinārāyanaswamy temple and was dismissed from office in connection with certain thefts committed in the temple. He laid claim to the vacant office of Cheekka Parpathegarship when Venkatāchara-riyalkar was appointed and Government in their Proceedings decision No $\frac{1-73}{\text{Rev. F } 46\ 96}$ dated 20th November 1873 directed him to urge his claim in a regular suit which he has not-

not done up to now. Moreover the Mugarai Secretary having held that the Parpatheyar's appointment is not a hereditary one so far back as 1895 Terumarna Iyengar is now barred by limitation from bringing a regular suit. It is not also desirable to appoint one for this responsible office who has once been dismissed from his Temple service. For these reasons I consider that Terumarnaiengar's claim should be rejected.

Sreenivasa Ramanuja Iyengar. In my humble opinion there should be two Parpatheyars to this large temple. More responsible supervision is absolutely necessary than what now prevails. The Jasdik Patti also provides for two Parpatheyars. The pay viz Rs 4/- a month is hardly sufficient for the onerous duties of this office.

In my humble opinion this

hard working individual should be given an increase. There is a carriage of Rs 7-8-0 per month in the Navapath. - Khana establishment as the persons who have to play on the Mukhaveny Nagaswaram (on 25th October) and Dodda thalla (Rs 6/8 0) do not perform their duties and hence are not being paid since the year 1902. This amount lapses every year and may be utilized for granting increase of pay to the Claimant.

Having now discussed the claims of the individuals named above I would strongly recommend the appointment of Singalachar Hiz Holiness Sri Parakala Yati and contends that by virtue of the Sanad of 1819, this appointment should be conferred upon his nominee Hiz Holiness belongs to the Vadakala Mutt. The

21n

contend that by
of the Sanad of 1829
His Holiness has no such privilege
His Holiness on the other hand urges
that this Sanad is a forgery and
that a copy of this alleged Sanad
from the Shaha Nama Register —
would be produced in support of the
contention. His Holiness was given time
to produce this copy from the 15th
April 1903 to 17th April 1905 and
the copy has not been produced
and the Mutt Agent simply says
that application for the copy has been
made to the Muzarai Secretary.
I think ample time has been given
and the report need not be delayed
for this reference. On the face
of it the contention of His Holiness
that the Mutt has the privilege of
nominating persons for vacancy

in the Melkote Temple seems irreconcilable with the existing state of affairs. When the last holder of the office of Chickkoparpatha-Jar ship Venkatanarsimhachar was appointed Sri Parakala Swami Mutt was not consulted and several appointments are now being made in the temple without any reference to the Mutt. The Sanad relied on by Sri Parakal Samy Mutt appears to me as a mere compliment to His Holiness the Swami.

The records connected with the case accompany.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Assistant-Commissioner
French Rocks.

213

1904 – 05



Please place this with the connected papers and continue the Office note

Js
29/5/05

From H. H. Sparkes Esq
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To Le Anantanarayana Rao Saly B.A.
Secretary to Govt
Revenue Dept

Dated 26th May 1905

Despatched

Received

General No 445
No.

Enclosure No.

Forwards in original a petition received from the agent of Sri Holenarasimhaswami Inam at Belgaum in re the Vatandi Parpathegars' Service Watan Lands in Belgaum District

No. 445/cir one 2nd

Deputy Commissioner's office
Mysore District
Muzrai Department
Dated Mysore 26th May 1905.

To

C. Avanthasami Rao Esq: B.A
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of
Mysore, in the Muzrai Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No 430 of the 11/20th May 1905 reporting on the claims of the various individuals for the Volagudi Parapathegar's post in the Sri Narayana Swamy temple at Melkote, French Rocks Sub Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith a petition dated 22nd May 1905, in original, received from the agent of His Holiness the Sri Parakala Swamy Matt at Mysore requesting that certain documentary evidences may be obtained from the said Matt before submitting the

records

records to Government for orders, and complaining that the Assistant Commissioner French Rocks Division, appears to have formed an one-sided opinion on a forged Sannad of 1829.

2 An endorsement to the effect that the records have been forwarded to your office and that your reply should be awaited, has been given to the agent of the said Matt.

I have the honor to be

Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner
Dharwar District

cfs

C.8.1067

Post
that the
I correspondence
been forwarded
herewith
will also this
this reply
will be awaited
Illegible Sparkes
27/5/05
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

W. H. Sparkes Esquire
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Sir,

The agent of the holy Sri parakala Swami Mutt at Mysore respectfully begs to state that in the matter of the appointment of the Volagudi parapattegar in the Sri Narayanaswamy temple at Melkote, French Rocks Sub Taluq, it is learnt that the Assistant Commissioner of the French Rocks Division has reported to the Deputy Commissioner's office prejudicially to the interests of the Sri parakala Swami Mutt without giving it an opportunity to produce certain documentary evidence in support of the privileges enjoyed by the Mutt in regard to the appointment in question.

The Assistant Commissioner of the French Rocks Division appears to have formed an ex parte opinion and forged Sanad of 1829 and on the ground that the genuine Sanad was not produced by the Mutt [illegible]

[illegible]

That a copy of the Sannad from the Shahanama Register which has already been applied for from the Military Secretary is awaited and that it is no fault of the Mutt if the Military Secretary has not complied with the requisition of the Mutt.

He further begs to state that it is needless for the Mutt to express the act that the Sannad granted by the late Maharaja, His Highness the Sri Krishna Raja Wodayar Bahadur, should be respected and that the matter has finally to be disposed of on receipt of the copy of the Sannad applied for from the Military Secretary.

He therefore prays that the necessary evidences may kindly be obtained from the Mutt before submitting the records to Government for orders.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

ఆదాయపన్ను శాఖకు చెల్లించిన మొత్తం పన్ను వివరాలు తెలియజేయండి.

ఈ వ్యక్తులకు 2020-21 సంవత్సరానికి ఎంత పన్ను చెల్లించాలి?

[illegible]

By Order,
25/5/05
Secretary to Govt,
Mnzeria Department

19/5/05

Issue this but keep a correct copy of the Samad getting my signature to it
25/5/05

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3239
SECRETARIAT

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು 26-2-1905.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3698

122
16/11/05

Submitted for orders
16/11/05

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಬಿ.ಇ.ಒ-ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರ/ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ಎಲ್.ಸಿ/ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ/2005-06/ 150 ದಿನಾಂಕ: 27.11.2005

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ/ಅನುದಾನಿತ/ಖಾಸಗಿ ಪ್ರೌಢಶಾಲಾ ಮುಖ್ಯೋಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರಿಗೆ

ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಿಂದ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದ ನಂತರ ಯಾವುದೇ ಶಾಲೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

1) ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದರು? ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿದ್ದರು? ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಅನುತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿದ್ದರು? ಅನುತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾದ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

2) ಕಳೆದ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದ ಮಕ್ಕಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಈ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

3) ಕಳೆದ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದ ಮಕ್ಕಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಈ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಮೇಲಿನ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಿಂದ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದ ನಂತರ ಯಾವುದೇ ಶಾಲೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

1) ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದರು? ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿದ್ದರು? ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಅನುತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿದ್ದರು? ಅನುತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾದ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

2) ಕಳೆದ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದ ಮಕ್ಕಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಈ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

3) ಕಳೆದ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದ ಮಕ್ಕಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಈ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

No. 5

2015 Date 24.4.08

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4381
HUZRAT SECRETARIAT

24-5-905

Please confirm receipt of this
Office note now
under preparation, bringing in this
representation now made

ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ.

ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಇ 4438 ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ: 29:5:05

ಈ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ.

By order.

Secretary.

Dated 16-5-05

To

The Manager
Canara Bank
Main Branch
Kurnool

Sir,

Sub: Loan application

I am in need of a loan of Rs. 4438 for my personal purpose. I request you to kindly sanction the loan at the earliest.

Yours faithfully

22/5/05

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4270
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT



Received by Singi Ramulu
10/7/05

వస్తే ఫలితం

శ్రీమతి ... గారికి

... నుండి ...

... ...

... ...

... ...

246

~~189~~ 1905-1906

FROM

A. H. Sharkey Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

TO

L. Srinivasaraghava Raghavachar B.A.
Secy: to Govt: Revenue Dept

Dated 15th June 1905

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No. (1)



Submitted in continuation

17.7.05

Sent returned with Govt. Pro. on 2.3.07

Submits another petition received from the agent of the Sri Para Kaisaraja Swami at Melkote praying that the Patel's watan of that village may be restored to the family

Deputy Commissioners office
Mysore District

Dated Mysore 15th July 1905.

No. 35
Encl 2

To

L. Anantasawmi Rao Esqr B.A.
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of
Mysore, Revenue Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letters nos: 430 and 445 dated 11/20 th and 26th May 1905 respectively, I have the honor to forward herewith in original for favour of orders petition Registered No. 7/34 dated the 10th July 1905 with its one enclosure received from the Agent (Ranga Char) of the Sri Parakala Swamy Mutt at Mysore regarding the appointment of Chikka Parthasarathy in the Chelluvarayaswamy's temple at Melkote, French Rocks Sub Dalk, praying that full investigation may be made and the parties concerned be heard in the matter represented therein.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servt

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Dist

ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದೆ.

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

23-11-06

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳು

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

Forwarded to Secretary to Govt. of Karnataka
Department.
23.11.06

Registrar
C.R.S

మళ్ళీ మూడు ప్రశ్నలకు సమాధానాలు
బరవరమవుతూ మళ్ళీ ప్రారంభిస్తే

మీ మిత్రుడు బోధిస్తూ ఉన్నాడు. ఆ విషయం
రచయిత వ్రాసిన వాక్యాలలో చిన్న పొరపాటు
కనిపిస్తే వెంటనే దాన్ని సరిదిద్దుకోవాలి లేకపోతే
ఆ భాష నేర్చుకోవడంలో ఇబ్బందులు వస్తాయి.

1. ఇదని చిన్న పొరపాటుకే కొట్టివేయడం వ్యర్థం
అని వదిలివేయడం కూడదు.

2 వ్యక్తిని బట్టి వ్యక్తీకరణ భిన్నంగా
ఉంటుంది అలాంటప్పుడు ఇబ్బందులు వస్తాయి. అలాంటి
అవకాశాన్ని మీరు ఇవ్వకూడదు. మీరు రచయిత
యొక్క భాషను నేర్చుకోవడంలో కీలకమైన

3 ఆలా కాకుండా ప్రతిదానిలో తప్పులు
ఉన్నాయని ప్రారంభంలోనే ప్రయత్నిస్తే
రచయిత చెప్పేది మీరు ఎప్పటికీ అర్థం
చేసుకోలేరు.

4 అలాంటప్పుడు భవిష్యత్తులో మీరు
ఇంగ్లీష్ మాట్లాడలేరు - ఆ వ్యక్తిని ఇబ్బంది
పెట్టండి. వ్యక్తిని బట్టి

244

190 .

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

OFFICE NOTE.

File No.

SUBJECT.

From

Srinivasa Ramanujiengar, Melkote.

Petition No. 4023 Dated 20th March 1926

Srinivasa Ramanujiengar, Olagudu Sampatkumaragar of the Melkote temple states that since the death of the permanent incumbent of the office Sampathkumari, he has been attending to its duties in addition to his own. He prays that the pay of the post which is being brought under the head "Savings" may be ordered to be paid to him; and that orders may be issued to make monthly payments in future pending the disposal of the question of appointing some competent man to the post

Subuhd. Both The appointments carry a

24

File No. of Muzrai Secretariat.

Salary of Rs 4/- and Rs 3-12-0 per mensem- respectively

Submitted
24/3/06

GPB--2000--13-2-05

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

An English abstract of the petition from Sreenivasa Ramanujiengar olagudi parpathegar of the Melkote temple.

The petitioner states that he is one of the two olagudi parpathegars of the temple on a small salary of Rs 4 per mensum, that for the past 4 or 5 years, since the death of one of the olagudi parapathegars, he has been attending to the duties of both these responsible appointments, and that the question of additional pay for the extra-work turned out by him and also promotion is now under the consideration of Government. He represents that a new man by name Singlachar has been recommended for the olagudi parpathegard. He further states that there are 4

GPB - 3,000 22-6 06

claimants to the post (including himself) that 3 of them have no right to it for the reasons stated; and prays that the post may be conferred on him and that additional pay claimed by him may be ordered to be disbursed at an early date. He adds that the parpathegaram post of the Srirangapatam temple, carries with it a salary of Rs 12 per mensem.

Submitted

The file on the subject has been submitted to the Dewan

Submitted to the Dewan in continuation

19/11/06

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ 2.6-11-95.

249

1905 - 06.



From
H. Sparkes Esqr.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
L. Anantasamni Rao Esqr. B.A.
Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore

Dated 23rd May 1906.
Despatched
Received
General No. 572
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Forward for favour of orders two Sanads received from the agent of the Sri Para-Kalaswami Mutt at Mysore re Valagadi Parpathegaru's appointment in the Sri Narayana Swami temple at Melkote

Ver records returned with Govt Pro. dt 2.307.

MGCPB—50 reams—6-12-02

Fo 5-1/
1906
To

Office of the Diwan Peishkar
Mysore Division
Dated Bangalore 23rd May 1906

249

From

T. Ananthaswamy Pillai Esquire B.A.
Secretary to His Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
in charge of the Diwan's Office, Bangalore

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No. 1145 dated the 26th May 1905 regarding the Valagundi Parpathegar's post in the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote, French Rocks Sub Zalak, I have the honor to forward herewith for favour of early orders the marginally noted two Zadies received from the agent of His Holiness the Sri Parakala Swami Mutt at Mysore requesting that early orders may be passed on the pending question of the Valagundi Parpathegar's post and issue of orders that the pay of the post in question should be brought under Savings as heretofore pending final orders of Government.

No.	Date
122	23.4.06
133	2.5.06

2. As regards the recommendation of the Asstt Commissioner referred to in para 4 of the accompanying English report No 1022 dated 5/6.5.1906, orders have been issued to the Assistant Commissioner stating that I cannot sanction

The

the disbursement of the pay and that it should accordingly be brought under Savings pending Government orders.

3. The agent of the Sri Parakal Swami Matt has also been informed that the Inam Yadis received from the Matt have been forwarded to Government for favour of orders and that orders have been issued to the Assistant Commissioner to bring the pay of the Valagudi Parpathegaris appointment under savings pending Government orders.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
your most obedient
servant

Deputy Commissioner
Coimbatore District

cpd
150.

Petition dated the
26th April 1901 from
one Kuruga Simmanniger
of Melkote Claiming
the Vadagundi Pariatha-
-gari's post in the
Sri Narayanaswami
temple at Melkote in
the Seringapatam Taluk.

(ii) Telegram and
petition dated the 28th
January 1902 from
Ramanujammi Nara-
-simhachar and
others of Melkote on
the same subject.

(iii) Letter No 430
dated the 20th January
1902

from the Dy Comr
Guntur District.

(iv) Petition no 143/1452
dated the 28th May 1905
from the Agent of the
Sri Parvatala matt

(v) Petitions from
Gangadi Venkata-
Narasimhulu and
Singi Ramalingam
of Nellore -

---

order:- No. 3418 D/ 16.1.07

The petitions
read by Dy Comr's
letters dated 11th Dec. 1906 & 6th Jan.
1907 relate to one
of the two Valayati Purushottam's
~~in the~~ appointments

~~The~~ Priests in the Sri
Narasimha Swamy Temple
at Ahobilam, which
has, for ' ' owing to the death of the
permanent incumbent,

the appointment in
~~Jaffna~~ was held by
an Chelvanayaga Iyer
father of the late Sir
Ponnambalam Ramanathan
a Bengali Brahmin),
year 1862 he was
transferred to the Sri
Jayadharmaswami-
swami temple at
Devanayakanpattu, but
on his failure to join
the latter institution,
his services were dis-
-pensed with in 1863
by an order of the late
Superintendent of the
Archaeological Department.

Subsequently a Smartha

Brahmin by name

Venkatarama Sastri

was appointed to the post,

but he too was dismissed

in by Government in

on account of misconduct

the year 1866 and

a third individual named

Kothur Ramgachar,

(a Vadagale Brahmin), and after

whom appointed him his

brother Venkata Narasimhachar

was appointed to the

Office - The last-named

individual died in

1901 and the succession

to it was being disputed

by Ramaya Timmaiengar

(s/o Chikkamaya

Iyengar) and Krishnaiengar

(son of Kalimuthu Ramanathan), but- also
the latter since died
at present
There are several
claimants to the post:
each, claiming it on
some relationship
or other to the previous
Bandaranaikes, and the
~~other Parties in Parlia-~~
~~ment Representing~~
ways that the two
Parliamentary seats be amalgamated
and given to him by
increasing his present
salary viz Rs 4 [illegible]
Parliamentary [illegible]
but in a representation
claiming the right
to [illegible]

to tell me -

They base their claim upon an Ayukutta Patti of the Melkote temple dated the 1st March 1819, prescribed by His Highness the Maharaja Krishnaraja Wadeyar Bahadur III and on the Nirup granted by His Highness to the Amildar of Attikoppa on the 10th December 1817.

2. The Swamis of Melkote have petitioned Government representing that the Sira Parakala matt has no manner of control over the affairs of

of the Mukhta temple came
in support of their
contention they have
submitted the original
of the Firman dated the
11th October 1829 issued
by H. H. the late Maharaja
Krishnaraja Wadeyar
Bahadur III to the Amil
of the late Attikuppa Sub
in which it was directed
that the Mutt should
have no part of control
over the affairs of the
temple and that the
management thereof
should vest entirely
with Government Officer
The Mutt however

. the genuineness

of this Court and calls it a forgery.

Having briefly set-forth the facts of the case as above, the Court proceed to dispose of the claims of the several individuals as detailed below :—

2. The chief points for decision in this case are :—

(i) Whether the appointment in question is a hereditary one as claimed by some of the petitioners ;

(ii) Whether the valuable Sanads are necessary and if so whether the right of nomination to the

Vacant-post rests with
his successor subject
as claimed by it.

4 On the question
of the hereditary nature
of such appointments
there are no hard and
fast rules, specifying
distinctly what appointments
are hereditary. In the
Commissioner Sir Mark
Cubbon's Circular
dated 26th October 1854
it was ruled that the
suits for Injuri rights
should not be adjudicated
upon by the Civil Courts
but by the Amildars
in the Mirasi Dept-
and that the appeals

on such decisions
should go up to the
Commissioner's Huzur.
In the Proceedings of
Government in the Inspl
Department no 77-85
cir
dated the 19th April 1892
it was observed that
the appointment of
Parpathyars in temples
was not hereditary -
And again, Rai Bahadur
M. Srinivasachariar,
the former Inspl
Secretary, gave it
as his opinion in this
very case that the
Parpathyar's appointments -
whether Head Parpathyar
or Chief Parpathyar -
are not hereditary -

Taking all these circum-
-stances into consider-
-tion, and also the fact
that the appointment
of Chief Pandithurayar
(the designation which has since been
changed to "Valangadi
Pandithurayar") in this
temple was not only
not held in hereditary
succession but was
given away to hunters since 1862.
quite unconnected
with the previous incum-
-bents, the Court was
pleased to direct that
the petitioners, who
have claimed the
appointment on hereditary
-ditary basis be impleaded

that the post in question

is not a hereditary one -

5 Regarding the necessity or otherwise

for filling up the vacant

post, the Assistant

Commr and the Dy Commr

are both of opinion that

there should be two

Valampuri Pandithargals

for the responsible supervision

of this important temple

and recommend that

Singhachari, retired

2nd grade Clerk and

present manager of

the temple, may be appointed

to the vacant post as

one of the Valampuri

Pandithargals - The Govt

are pleased to accept their

263

recommendation and
confirm the appointment
on Singhalese. He
should however be
distinctly informed
that the appointment
is not hereditary and
that it cannot be
claimed by his de-
scendants after him -

6. As regards the
representation put in
by the Sinhalese
in the matter of
~~claiming that~~
~~right to appoint a person~~
~~to~~ filling the existing
vacancy, it is seen
that the Maatt claims
authority over the
whole

temple and not- merely
over the question of the
appointment- of Valu-
-yadi Sampathungar.
From the Ayakattu Patti
of the temple dated the
1-st- March 1819 and the
Nirup of the 10th- December 1817
~~it is seen~~ on which
the mutt bases its claim,
it- is observed that-
the payment- of the
Charges on account-
of Pandituru and
Establishment- in the
temple was ordered
to take effect- from such
date as the Swami of
the Sri Parakala mutt
might- name and that-

Amildar of Attakurthy
(which includes Melkote) was directed
to consult the Swamie
in regard to the ex-
-penditure incurred
in the temple and to
take the Swamie's
advice in the matter
accordingly As regards the
affair of 1819 in the
Agraharam Patti it would
seem that about that
time the Sri Parakala
Swamie was actually
residing at Melkote and
that H. H. the Maharaja
had given him full
powers in the manage-
-ment of the Melkote
temple & Endowments

~~however~~ after the Swami
took up his permanent residence
at Mysore, ~~it appeared~~
~~that~~ all the temple affairs
were being conducted
by Government Officers.
So that whether the
Samand of 1829 ~~is~~ produced by the party against the matt is
genuine or not, the
question arises whether
it is expedient to revive
now a state of affairs
that existed more
than half a century
ago - .

7 There is nothing
to show that during
the many changes
that took place in the
post of Chief Purohithgar since
~~in~~ the year 1862, the

matt put forward.
its claim to the nomi-
-nation to that
appointment. Further,
the nature of the
appointment is to
manage the affairs
of the temple in imme-
-diate subordination
to the Sanhedrin and
for such a post a
person competent
to conduct such
duties should be
appointed by Govt
and not at the
pleasure of the matt

8. Under these
circumstances the
Govt-

direct that the draft

be informed ~~by letter~~

~~by Cable~~ that the

documents relied upon

by them relate to a

past state of affairs

which do not exist

now, and that their

claim to ~~make any~~

~~appointment in lieu~~

~~and that temple~~ the

right of nominating

a man to the vacant

Consul- he accepted

by Government.

(Dennis)
order

Secretary

Private Secy

Foreign Dept-

19/12/06

To

The Hy. Comr, Pretoria

No. 3961 5/16.2.07

Annexure J

Copy of the Agreement between the Sarakunda Mutt with reference to the Agent's petition

Endorsement to the petitioners

READ—

Petition, dated the 26th April 1901, from one Karaga Tirunaranaiengar of Melkote, claiming the Valagudi Parpattegar's post in the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote in the Seringapatam Taluk.

Telegram and petition, dated the 28th January 1902, from Ramanujamuni Narasimha Char and others of Melkote on the same subject.

Letter No. 430, dated the 20th May 1905, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

Petition No. 143—4452, dated the 28th May 1905, from the Agent of the Sri Parakala Matt.

Petitions from Jeergudi Venkatanarasimha Char and Singi Perumaliengar of Melkote.

No. 3418—MUZ. F. 150-92, DATED BANGALORE, 10TH JANUARY 1907.

ORDER THEREON.—The petitions and the Deputy Commissioner's letter read above relate to one of the two Valagudi Parpattegar's posts in the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote, which has fallen vacant owing to the death of the permanent incumbent. The appointment in question, which carries a salary of Rs. 3-12-0 per mensem, was held by one Cheluvaraya Iyengar, father of the petitioner Karaga Tirunaranaiengar (a Tengalai Sri Vaishnava Brahmin). In the year 1862 he was transferred to the Sri Gangadhareswaraswami temple at Seringapatam, but on his failure to join the latter institution, his services were dispensed with in 1863 by an order of the late Superintendent of the Ashtagram Division. Subsequently a Smartha Brahmin by name Venkataramanasastri was appointed to the post, but he too was dismissed by Government in the year 1866 on account of misconduct, and a third individual named Kotnur Ranga Char, (a Vadagale Brahmin) and after him his brother Venkatanarasimha Char were appointed to the office. The last named individual died in 1901 and the succession to the post was disputed by Karaga Tirunaranaiengar (son of Cheluvaraya Iyengar) and Krishnaiengar (son of Kotnur Ranga Char) but the latter also since died. There are at present several claimants to the post, most of them claiming it on some relationship or other to the previous Baravarddars, and the others bringing forward their claims on other grounds. Ramanuja Iyengar who is the other existing Valagudi Parpattegar prays that the two Parpattegar's posts be amalgamated and given to him by increasing his present pay, *viz.*, Rs. 4. The Sri Parakala Matt has put in a representation claiming the right to appoint a person to fill the vacancy. They base their claim upon an Ayakattupatti of the Melkote temple, dated the 1st March 1819, prescribed by His Highness the Maharaja Krishna Raja Wadayar Bahadur, III and on the Nirup granted by His Highness to the Amildar of Attikuppa on the 10th December 1817.

2. The Tengales of Melkote have petitioned Government representing that the Sri Parakala Matt has no manner of control over the affairs of the Melkote temple and in support of their contention they have submitted the original of the Nirup, dated the 11th October 1829, issued by His Highness the late Maharaja Krishna Raja Wadayar Bahadur, III to the Amildar of the late Attikuppa Taluk in which it was directed that the Matt should have no sort of control over the affairs of the temple and that the management thereof should vest entirely with Government officers. The Matt however impugns the genuineness of his Nirup and calls it a forgery.

3. The chief points for decision in this case are—

(1) Whether the appointment in question is a hereditary one as claimed by some of the petitioners; and

(2) whether two Valagudi Parpattegars are necessary and if so, whether the right of nomination to the vacant post rests with the Sri Parakala Matt as claimed by it.

4. On the question of the hereditary nature of such appointments there are no hard and fast rules, specifying distinctly what appointments are hereditary. In the Commissioner Sir Mark Cubbon's Circular dated 26th October 1854 it was

ruled that the suits for Pujari rights should not be adjudicated upon by the Civil Courts, but by the Amildars in the Muzrai Department and that the appeals on such decisions should go up to the Commissioner's Huzur. In the Proceedings of Government in the Muzrai Department No. 77-85—Cir., dated the 19th April 1892, it was observed that the appointment of Parpattegars in temples was not hereditary. And again, Rai-Bahadoor Mr. Sreenivasa Charlu, the former Muzrai Secretary, gave it as his opinion in this very case that the Parpattegar's appointments-whether Head Parpattegar or Chikparpattegar—are not hereditary. Taking all these circumstances into consideration and also the fact that the appointment of Chikparpattegar (the designation which has since been changed to "Valagudi Parpattegar") in this temple was not only not held in hereditary succession but was given away since 1862 to parties quite unconnected with the previous incumbents, the Government direct that the petitioners who have claimed the appointment on hereditary *hak* be informed that the post in question is not a hereditary one.

5. Regarding the necessity or otherwise for filling up the vacant post, the Assistant Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner are both of opinion that there should be two Valagudi Parpattegars for the responsible supervision of this important temple and recommend that Singla Char, retired 2nd grade Pleader, and present Manegar of the temple, may be appointed to the vacant post as one of the Valagudi Parpattegars. The Government are pleased to accept their recommendation and confer the appointment on Singla Char. He should however be distinctly informed that the appointment is not hereditary, and that it cannot be claimed by his descendants after him.

6. As regards the representation put in by the Sri Parakala Matt in the matter of filling up the existing vacancy it is seen that the matt claims authority over the whole temple and not merely over the question of the appointment of Valagudi Parpattegar. From the Ayakattu Patti of the temple dated the 1st March 1819 and the Nirup of the 10th December 1817 on which the Matt bases its claim it is observed that the payment of the charges on account of Paditara and establishment in the temple was ordered to take effect from such date as the Swami of the Sri Parakala Matt might name and that the Amildar of Attikuppa (which include Melkote) was directed to consult the Swami in regard to the expenditure incurred in the temple and to take the Swami's advice in the matter. As regards the Nirup of 1819 in the Ayakat Patti it would seem that about that time the Sri Parakalaswami was actually residing at Melkote and that H. H. the Maharaja had given him full powers in the management of the Melkote temple; but that subsequently however, after the Swami took up his permanent residence at Mysore, all the temple affairs were being conducted by Government Officers, so that whether the Sannad of 1829 produced by the party against the Matt is genuine or not the question arises whether it is expedient to revive now a state of affairs that existed more than half a century ago.

7. There is nothing to show that during the many changes that took place in the post of Chikparpattegar since the year 1862, the Matt put forward its claim to the nomination to that appointment. Further the nature of the appointment is to manage the affairs of the temple in immediate subordination to the Peshkar and for such a post a person competent to conduct such duties should be appointed by Government and not at the pleasure of the Matt.

8. Under these circumstances, the Government direct that the Matt be informed that the documents relied upon by them relate to a past state of affairs which does not exisit now, and that their claim to the right of nominating a man to the vacant post cannot be accepted by Government.

Secy., Muz. Dept.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, returning the records

Encl—[illegible]

1906-07

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 10th January 1907

No. 3418
Muz. F 150-92

Passing orders on the claim of the Sri Parakala Matt to appoint one of the two Valagudi Parpattegars in the Sri Narayanswami temple at Melkote.

GPB—15-2-07—200

2 పుట

27/1

26.3.07

శ్రీ వేంకటేశ్వర సుప్రభాతం రాసిన
రంగవల్లి కుంటుంబమువారు ఇ
లాంటిదే

మాదాలయ్యగారి తరగతి
రచయిత్రులు

నివు కుటుంబం మాకు మాదాలయ్య
కుటుంబం 1905 లలో నివసించిన్నారు
15 ఇళ్ళలో ఒకే కుటుంబం వారు
ఇంటిని కుటుంబం అందరి కుటుంబ
వారసులు

మాదాలయ్య చేతి నాంచారు ఇల్లు స్థంభాలు
ఎలవరపిల్లవసిద్ధి నదవళ్ళు ఎందువల్ల
లనిజ్ఞ కండి. చాలవరంలు లక్ష్మీనరసిం
హ్మ రాయుడు లక్ష్మ. అల్లుందలు వరిక్ష్మ
ధ్వంసరదములలో 1862 లలో
శ్రీరంగవల్లి శ్రీనంచంద్ర కోడ్ల

[illegible]

By order

[illegible]

Secretary Murshid

Dewan

[illegible]

5/3/07